A LETTER

TO THE REV.

Mr. RALPH CHURTON, &c.

ERRATA.

Page 4. attaining at the truth, read *coming at the truth.* p. 18. read *ſays* for ays. p. 32. firſt line the word *what* is omitted, which it ſhould not be, read therefore *what.* p. 57. line the 19th, the word *with* is omitted, which ought not to be. Read therefore *with* which. &c. p. 63, read *fatum*, not *falam.* p. 64. *Priapum*, not *Priapam.* p. 67, read *Effigiem*, not *Effigiam.* p. 99. read *Variat*: not *variat.* p. 102. line 8. dele *his.*

A

LETTER

TO THE REV.

Mr. RALPH CHURTON, M. A.

Rector of Middleton-Cheney in Northamptonshire;

ON HIS

Address to his Parishioners.

From FRANCIS EYRE of WARKWORTH, ESQ.

"It is a shame to charge men with what they are not guilty "of, and to make the breach wider, already too wide.

Dr. Montague, protestant bishop of Chichester, and afterwards of Norwich on the Invocation of Saints. p. 60.

LONDON:

Printed by J. P. COGHLAN, No. 37, Duke-street, Grosvenor-square; and Sold by Messrs, BOOKER, Bond-Street; KEATING, Warwick-Street; LEWIS, Russel-Street; DE-BRETT, Piccadilly; and ROBINSONS, Pater-Noster Row.

M DCC XCV.

The Reader will readily perceive in the courſe of a few pages the motive for publiſhing this letter. It is therefore only neceſſary to add that if an anſwer had not been extorted, no notice whatever would have been taken of the Clergyman's addreſs. It has however been a matter of ſurprize to ſome people that ſuch an addreſs ſhould have been preſented to an unoffending neighbour. But they ought to reflect that overflowing zeal is ſeldom accompanied by reaſon and prudence.

A LETTER, &c.

REVEREND SIR,

SINCE you have been pleaſed to preſent me with one of the pamphlets which you lately addreſſed to your pariſhioners of Middleton-Cheney, accompanied by a note, wherein you aſſure me that you are as cordially ſolicitous for my *eternal*, as *temporal* felicity, gratitude as well as good manners require my beſt thanks.

You deſire me to peruſe it with *candour* and *impartiality*. I have done ſo, and ſhall with equal candour and impartiality give you my ſentiments. If they have not been tranſmitted to you ſooner, you will have the goodneſs to reflect that it requires much more time to confute, than to cenſure. Do not ſuppoſe, however, that I am inſenſible to the diſadvantages I lie under. I am called forth to combat the aſſertions of a reverend Divine, and

to appear before a prejudiced public. Notwithſtanding theſe diſagreeable circumſtances, I ſhall ſpeak, Sir, the genuine ſentiments of my heart: ſentiments, from which I have never had reaſon as yet to depart. Conſoled by the conſciouſneſs of interior rectitude, I have hitherto diſregarded the many ſarcaſms, and bitter invectives which have been frequently thrown out againſt the religion I profeſs. I have regarded them as the haſty ebullitions of prejudice and ignorance, which time and better information would neceſſarily one day cauſe to ſubſide. In fact, Sir, much of that religious rancour has ſubſided, I am therefore truly ſorry that you have revived the odious controverſy. However ſince you have been pleaſed to call upon me ſo particularly, it is my duty to follow the injunction of St. Peter, (you ſee, Sir, that I read the bible ſometimes) who exhorts us to be "always rea-" dy to give an anſwer to every man that " aſketh a reaſon of the hope that is in us " with meekneſs and fear." (1 Pet. iii. 15.) I flatter myſelf, Sir, that I ſhall throughout this letter, which I have now the honor to addreſs to you, obſerve that *meekneſs*, mildneſs and good manners, which he ſo forcibly recommends.

Mine

Mine is not the religion of this country, as now eſtabliſhed by law, I confeſs. I ſhall not therefore pretend to obtrude upon the public any of my principles farther than is neceſſary to prove the fallacy of your aſſertions. I bow obedience to the laws; conſcious that whoever diſobeys them, diſobeys God, according to St. Paul. (Rom. xiii. 2.) Content and grateful for the portion of liberty I enjoy, I feel it a duty to confine them within my breaſt; unleſs called forth, as I have been by your polite notice, to rectify ſome miſconceptions relating to them. Silence therefore on my part would not only be diſregarding the injunctions of St. Peter, but appear inattentive to your proffered kindneſs.

Since providence has choſen for my reſidence here on earth a country wherein the principles of the religion in which I was educated are not now adopted, I thought it not only my duty, but I found it my immediate intereſt to aſcertain the value of them. For this purpoſe I read, I believe, moſt of the beſt of your controverſial writers. I peruſed the bible alſo, as my duty required, with particular attention, for I never heard of any reſtrictions being laid on the reading of it by our paſtors, but ſuch as were merely temporary and local.

Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth, as alſo James I. laid a temporary reſtraint upon preaching without a ſpecial licence, as Hume informs us, yet preachiug is of divine inſtitution, and its obligation expreſſed in the goſpels and in St. Paul's epiſtles with far more evidence than reading the bible.

Now, Sir, by comparing the objections which you have made to ſeveral of our principles, and many principles which out of your bounty you have been pleaſed to make for us, and which I confidently aſſure you we neither do, or ever did hold, I find you have only trod in the hackneyed paths of thoſe controvertiſts, whoſe aſſertion have been repeatedly, and (in my opinion) ſolidly confuted. Does it not ſtrike you, Sir, that it is a ſtrangeway of attaining at the truth to apply to the enemies of a party, to be informed of the principles of that party? Had you been pleaſed to buy one of our catechiſms, which you might have done for a few pence, you might have gained due information on the ſubject. It would have ſaved you the double weight of calumny and injuſtice, and myſelf the diſagreeable taſk of diſſenting from your opinions.

The driſt of your firſt chapter, Sir, as it appears to me, attempts to prove that the bible,

or

or the written word of God *alone* furniſhes us with every thing neceſſary to ſalvation. "The "ſcriptures" you ſay, "plainly teach and aſ- "ſert their own ſufficiency for the great pur- "poſe of ſalvation, ſo that whatever is not "read therein, or may be proved thereby, is "not required of any man that it ſhould be "believed as an article of faith, or be thought "requiſite, or neceſſary to ſalvation." (p. 5.) Hence you ſeem plainly to inſinuate in the next page, "that catholics heretofore not be- "ing allowed the uſe of the bible; or, till "very lately permitted to read it, they were "not, if they now are, in the way to ſalvation." A very charitable inſinuation indeed! But it is not correct, as I ſhall preſently ſhow you. In the firſt place you ought to have informed us what articles are neceſſary to ſalvation. But this is "a controverſy" as Dr. Burnet ſays, "which wiſe people are unwilling to "meddle with*." In the mean time, Sir, give me leave to ſay that, upon reflexion, you yourſelf muſt be convinced that it is impoſ- ſible for every deſcription of people to acquire a competent knowledge of all things neceſſary to ſalvation from the bible, or written word

* xxxix Articles, Art. 19.

of

of God *alone*, for there have been, are, and will be to the end of the world, infinite diſputes not only concerning the number of canonical books, but reſpecting the true and literal ſenſe of them. The dead letter, you know Sir, cannot ſpeak for itſelf. Wherefore it is through tradition alone, that we can aſcertain both the one and the other. Such is our opinion: ſuch is the opinion of your divines: and ſuch muſt be your own opinion, when you argue againſt thoſe who have ſeparated from your church.

When I ſay ſuch is our opinion, I ſpeak not of thoſe pharaſaical traditions, which you allude to from St. Mark (chap. vii. 13.) but of the traditions of the apoſtles. Of thoſe traditions, which St. Paul recommends to the Theſſalonians, (ii. 15.) to the Galatians (i. 8, 9.) and to Timothy." The things thou haſt " heard of me among many witneſſes, the ſame " commit to faithful men, who ſhall be able " to teach others alſo." (2 Tim. ii. 2.) The ancient fathers of the church were ſo confident of the neceſſity of tradition that Irenæus, who lived in the ſecond age of Chriſt, does not heſitate to declare, that if the apoſtles . . . " had left us no ſcripture, we ought to fol- " low the order of tradition." (cap. iv. p. 205.)

In

In the third age, Tertullian ſaid, " what I be-
" lieve, I received from the preſent church,
" the preſent church from the primitive, that
" from the apoſtles, the apoſtles from Chriſt."
(de preſcrip. p. 209.)

In the third age, Origen declared that " in
" our underſtanding ſcripture, we muſt not
" depart from the firſt eccleſiaſtical tradition."
(in tract. 27. in St. Mat.) In the fourth age,
St. Athanaſius ſpoke to the ſame effect. " This
" doctrine," ſays he, " we have demonſtrated
" to have been delivered from hand to hand,
" by fathers to ſons." (1 homil. Concil. Nice-
ni.) If we attend to St. Chryſoſtom, who lived
alſo in the fourth century, and to Epiphanius
who lived about the ſame time, we ſhall hear
the ſame doctrine. The former ſays, " it is
" evident that the apoſtles did not deliver all
" things by writing, but many things without,
" and theſe are as worthy of credit, as the
" others." (in 2 Theſſ. ii. The latter declares
" that " we muſt uſe traditions, for the ſcrip-
" tures have not all things." (Hærefis 61.)

To prove your aſſertion, you quote, Sir,
the following text from St. John xx. 31,
" Theſe things are written that ye might be-
" lieve that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Son of
" God, and that believing ye might have life

" through

"through his name." p. 4. Therefore you ſuppoſe that St. John's goſpel contains all things neceſſary to ſalvation. I deny your conſequence; for St. John omitted many things of great moment; among others, the ſacrament of the euchariſt, which you know to be neceſſary to be believed. And you are ſo conſcious of what might be ſaid to refute your aſſertion, that you cautiouſly tack to St. John's goſpel the other three; and fearing theſe alſo may not ſufficiently anſwer your purpoſe, you add again the Acts of the Apoſtles, and to them all the other books from Geneſis to the Revelation. (p. 4.)

St. John indeed ſays "theſe things are "written, &c." but he does not ſay that theſe things were *only* written, or are ſufficient to ſalvation, which is the thing in queſtion, ſo that he excludes not the reſt of the goſpels nor apoſtolical traditions. And it is not unuſual in ſcripture to aſcribe the whole effect to that which is but the cauſe in part. Thus Chriſt promiſes happineſs to thoſe who practiſe every ſingle virtue, St. Matthew, chap. v. and St. Paul holds out ſalvation to every one who ſhall call on the name of our Lord, or confeſs with his mouth the Lord Jeſus, and believe that God hath raiſed him from the dead. Rom. x. 4, 9, 10.

x. 4, 9, 10. yet more than this is requiſite to ſalvation. Though St. Luke tells us, "he hath "written of all theſe things which Jeſus did and "taught," Acts i. 1. yet all things neceſſary to ſalvation are not contained in his goſpel. He wrote indeed all the principal paſſages of his life and death, and ſuch was the whole ſcope or intent of the evangeliſts; but not of all abſolutely which he did and taught. For in the ſame chapter he tells us, that during the forty days which Chriſt remained with them after his reſurrection, he appeared to them, and inſtructed them in the things concerning the kingdom of God, very few of which inſtructions are mentioned by St. Luke; which were great and many, according to St. John, ch. xvi. 12, 13, 14. Add to this what he ſays, ch. xxi. 25. "There are alſo many other things "which Jeſus did, the which if they ſhould be "written every one, I ſuppoſe that even the "world itſelf could not contain the books that "ſhould be written.

That "all ſcripture", as you ſay Sir, "is "given by inſpiration of God, and is profi-"table for doctrine, &c." (p. 4.) no chriſtian will deny. But is it ſufficient without tradition? If ſo, St. Paul contradicts himſelf, for as we have ſeen, he frequently recommends it.

Moreover St. Paul, in that chapter which you quote, 2 Tim. iii. 15, 17, ſpeaks of the old ſcripture, which Timothy had known from his youth, as is plain from the preceding text, which we readily acknowledge to be profitable, but not ſufficient. Neither would any more follow out of that text, if underſtood of the new teſtament. Thus you ſee, Sir, ſo far from denying the ſcriptures to be profitable, we deem them truly ſo, provided the ſenſe of them be taken, not as explained indeed by every individual, but as interpreted by the catholic church. This appears to me not only rational, and conformable to ſcripture, but to the ſentiments of your own divines.

Dr. Coſin, a learned proteſtant divine aſſures us that "we have no better, or other "external rule or teſtimony to guide us than "the conſtant voice of the catholic and uni- "verſal church, as it hath been delivered to "us from one generation to another." Scolaſtic. Hiſt. of the canon of Script. chap. 1. § 8. edit. Londini, 1672. And Dr. Walton, another proteſtant divine, obſerves "that the "word of God does not conſiſt in mere letters, "whether written or printed, but in the true "ſenſe, which no one can better interpret than "the true church, to which Chriſt committed

"this

"this ſacred pledge,—and for this reaſon, all "are ſtrictly obliged to hear her voice." In prolegomen. cap. v. ſect. 3. Biſhop Pearſon, whom you quote in your firſt page, ſays that "it is evident from ſcriptures themſelves, that "the whole of chriſtianity was at firſt deli- "vered to the biſhops ſucceeding the apoſtles "by *oral tradition*, and they were alſo com- "manded to keep it and deliver it to their ſuc- "ceſſors in the ſame manner. Nor is it any "where found in ſcripture, by St. Paul, or "any other of the apoſtles, that they would, "either jointly or ſeparately, write down all "they had taught as neceſſary to ſalvation; or "that they ſhould make ſuch a compleat ca- "non of them, that nothing ſhould be neceſ- "ſary to ſalvation, but what ſhould be found "in theſe writings." p. 78.

If this tradition, Sir, give me leave to add, be interrupted: if it has failed for any one age, the whole bible, for what we can know, might in that ſpace of time be changed and corrupted; nor can the contrary be proved without a freſh revelation. Let us only conſider how many things we are commanded to obſerve by the rules of the church, and which we practiſe, for which there is no warrant of ſcripture, but on the contrary are forbidden

by it. For example. What warrant have we for keeping the Sabbath on a Sunday, inſtead of Saturday, and for working on that latter day? All law-ſuits are likewiſe forbidden by the words of St. Matthew, v. 40. and by St. Paul, 1 Cor. vi. 7. All oaths, but a bare affirmative or negative like the quakers are equally forbidden by the words of St. James v. 12. And again by St. Matthew, v. 33, 34, 35, 36, 37. There are texts alſo againſt fighting in the wars. And there is neither precept or example, as you ſay yourſelf, for infant baptiſm in the new teſtament, p. 37. yet all theſe things are practiſed. What is it then that can aſſure us of the legality of ſo doing, but the conſtant and uniform cuſtom of the church, tranſmitted to us by eccleſiaſtical tradition? It is true our bleſſed Saviour ſays, "Suffer little children to come unto me, and "forbid them not: for ſuch is the kingdom "of God." St. Luke xviii. 16. But they did not come to be baptiſed, as the preceding verſe denotes. "They brought him alſo in-"fants that he ſhould touch them." And again from St. Matthew. "There were brought "unto him little children, that he ſhould put "his hands on them, and pray—and he laid his

" his hands upon them, and departed thence." ch. xix. 13, 15.

" What is in direct words declared in " ſcripture", you ſay, " is or may be read " therein, as *The Lord, our God is one Lord*, " &c." p. 3. Reaſon however teaches us as much. " But what is not thus literally aſ- " ſerted in ſcripture", you add, " may never- " theleſs be contained therein as to matter " and ſenſe, and may therefore by fair and " juſt conſequence, be proved thereby." p. 3. This you inſtance in the proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt. But you know, Sir, that the Greek church abſolutely denies the conſequence you draw. And was it ſo plain, as it ſeems to appear to you, we ought charitably to ſuppoſe that there could not be an Arian or Socinian in the world. Conſcious that the proceſſion from the Father and Son is not literally aſſerted in ſcripture, you add " may therefore " by fair and juſt conſequence be proved there- " by. For inſtance, we do not read in the new " teſtament that the Holy Ghoſt proceedeth " from the Son; but ſince he is called the " Spirit of the Son, and is ſaid to be ſent by " the Son, by which *evidently* proceſſion is ſig- " nified," &c. ib. But Biſhop Burnet, whoſe opinions you ſeem to copy, might have informed

formed you that "We" (to uſe his own words) "are far however from thinking that this proof "is ſo full and explicit, as to juſtify our ſepa- "rating from any church, or condemning it, "that ſhould ſtick exactly to the firſt creeds, "and reject this addition." Expoſ. of the 39 Art. Art. v. p. 70. I took the liberty, Sir, to draw a line under your word *evidently*, only to remark that was I to define your evidence, I ſhould call it an argument of things that do not *evidently* appear. To return however to our ſubject.

Surely, Sir, you cannot mean that the ſcriptures *alone* are ſufficient to ſalvation. It is the very ſenſe and meaning of them that is the object of diſpute. Every ſect, though ever ſo oppoſite to each other in its doctrines, pretend to find their opinions clearly expreſſed in ſcripture. The Lutherans declare that the ſcripture teaches them to hold the real preſence, the Calviniſts affirm that it teaches them the reverſe. You, Sir, with the church of England, maintain that, by fair and juſt conſequence, it enforces infant baptiſm; the Anabaptiſts deny it. The Socinians declare that the ſcripture plainly proves Chriſt to be a pure creature, and other Proteſtants maintain with us, that he is the eternal Creator of all things.

They

They all appeal to ſcripture, which of itſelf to this day has never decided one ſingle diſpute, and each of them form not a doubt but that their reſpective doctrines are contained therein. And how can it be otherwiſe? A mute code of laws cannot ſpeak for itſelf. Nothing therefore proves more forcibly the neceſſity of a conſtant, ſubſiſting tribunal to apply and determine the true ſenſe of them. To ſuppoſe that our divine maſter would leave us ſuch an apple of diſcord, ſuch a ſenſeleſs ſyſtem, is to repreſent him as the moſt imprudent and moſt ignorant of legiſlators. Moreover. Though the ſcripture *alone* be ſufficient to fix the faith of the learned, which it is not, of what uſe can it be to the ignorant, who are three fourths of mankind; to ſuch, for example, who cannot read? They muſt either be diſpenſed from having any religion at all, or muſt depend upon their teachers for inſtruction. To ſuppoſe then, excuſe me for repeating it, that a dead letter, a dumb writing, often obſcure, can be the means which God has pleaſed to make uſe of to teach mankind what they are to believe and practiſe, is to ſuppoſe an impoſſibility, an overſight which no human legiſlator, as yet, was ever guilty of.

For

For what is become of the unity of chriſtian faith in all thoſe ſects that have rejected the authority of the church, and pretended that the text of ſcripture alone ought to fix and determine their belief? In a ſhort time being divided into as many parties, as there were men found capable of drawing diſciples after them, they were made ſenſible of the inconvenience of their principles by their own embarraſſment. The firſt Lutherans complained bitterly of ſuch numerous broods in their own bowels, by which, they ſay, "the goſpel is loſt by lies and heinous errors, becauſe every one followeth his own "wit; and matters grow daily worſe and "worſe;" as we read in Nic. Amſdorf, pub. confeſs. & confut. Swermerorum. Even Luther himſelf, in Pſ. v. ſays, "Heretics have "not been overcome by violence or craft, "but by their own diſſenſions. Chriſt fights "againſt them by ſending upon them the ſpirit of giddineſs and diſagreement, as formerly he did on the Sichimites and builders "of Babel." John of Leyden, by reading the bible, and preaching his opinions thereon, made himſelf king of Munſter, and introduced polygamy, as Sleiden relates. Book x. A woman in that city, by reading the book of Judith,

dith, heated her imagination to that degree, as to attempt to kill the biſhop of Munſter in the midſt of his guards. An hiſtory of the blaſphemies, extravagances, impieties and crimes which have been preached within theſe two hundred years in Europe by men who ſet themſelves up for teachers of the goſpel, would be endleſs. Brandt in his hiſtory of the reformation in the Low Countries, among many other examples, tells us that David of Delft who preached inceſt and polygamy, ſaid to his companion, "Doſt thou not ſee how men raiſe "themſelves by turning preachers? how they "grow rich and powerful at an eaſy rate? We "have read the bible. Let us ſet up." They did ſo, and made a great figure at Baſil in conſequence of the undertaking. Such indeed is the diſagreement of thoſe who expound the ſcriptures of themſelves, that ſeldom two of them find the ſame ſenſe. You need only look at home, Sir, to be perſuaded of theſe melancholy truths. Had things been otherwiſe, it would have ſaved you the trouble of addreſſing thoſe who ſeparated themſelves from your church. This preſumption of interpreting the ſcriptures by private judgment has always been loudly complained of by the ancient fathers of the church. St. Jerome

proves that no one ought to ſtudy them without a guide and maſter, leſt he ſhould err; and laments that though no one takes upon himſelf to exerciſe any trade without having learnt it, yet all preſume to underſtand the ſcriptures; which he ſhews to be in every part difficult and obſcure to weak underſtandings. Epiſt. 2. ad Paulinum. St. Auguſtine, after his converſion, began by the advice of St. Ambroſe to read the prophet Iſaiah; but being deterred by the depth of his words and ſacred myſteries, deferred it till he ſhould be more verſed in the faith and in the fathers, as he ſays himſelf. Confeſſes. lib. ix. chap. 5. In his old age, he writes "that after "a long life ſpent in the unwearied ſtudy of "the divine books, a man would find their "myſteries ever growing upon him, and ſtill "lying deeper behind." Epiſt. 127 ad Voluſ. N. 3. "St. Baſil and Gregory Nazianzen," ays Rufinus the hiſtorian, "ſtudied the ſcrip-"tures, not with preſumption in themſelves, "but from the writings and authorities of the "elders, who were known to have received "from apoſtolic ſucceſſion the rule of under-"ſtanding them." Hiſt. lib. xl. c. 9.

We

We are ſenſible that all who read the ſcriptures, ſhould read them with the moſt profound reſpect, for the whole comes from the Holy Ghoſt, and there is nothing ſuperfluous in them, as St. Chryſoſtom ſays, Homil. 36. in Joan. Docility and ſubmiſſion are neceſſary diſpoſitions in the reading of them. To prevent then the ſacrilegious contempt and abuſes of theſe divine writings, there was a time when they were forbidden to be read in the vulgar languages by the lower claſſes of the people, without the leave and advice of their reſpective paſtors. Surely this was but a neceſſary precaution, when ſo many ſpurious verſions were ſent abroad. But even this did not amount to a prohibition: but an order only that the illiterate ſhould read them with advice, and it coſt the perſon deſirous of ſo doing no further trouble than to mention it to his paſtor. The paſtor, indeed, if circumſtances ſeemed to require it, would ſay ſomething to inſpire him with a juſt veneration of the ſacred books, and with a ſpirit of humility and devotion in reading them. This reſtraint then was in order to ſecure the people againſt the danger of novelty and error, which would neceſſarily follow if every cobler and tinker was allowed to interpret the ſcriptures ac-

cording to his weak ideas. The concluſion however often drawn from it is equally as falſe as it is unjuſt. It is ſaid that this reſtraint was only laid with a view of preventing the people from diſcovering the errors of the catholic religion. If ſuch were the caſe, it may be aſked whether of the two, the learned, or the unlearned, would be moſt likely to make the diſcovery? The former moſt certainly. On them then there is no reſtraint whatever laid. The divine books are open to all who underſtand Latin, or any other of the learned languages; and every one may read them (I repeat it) in the vulgar languages, if he only aſks the advice of his paſtor.

The unqualified manner of reading the ſcriptures, as practiſed in theſe days, muſt ſtrike every ſenſible and upright man with horror. The ingenious Mr. Benjamin Martin, in his preface to the *introduction to the Engliſh tongue*, laments and cenſures the profanation of putting the Bible into the hands of every bawling ſchool-miſtreſs, and of thoughtleſs children, to be torn, trampled upon, and made the early object of their averſion, by being their moſt tedious taſk, and their puniſhment. He is even inclined to aſcribe the growth of irreligion, and the contempt of holy

things

things among us to that ſource. If we are bound to honor the name of God, and all things which belong to religion, is not reſpect due to the word of God? The Mahometans pay the higheſt reverence to their fabulous *Koran*, and ſhall Chriſtians be allowed to profane in the moſt ſacrilegious manner the true oracles of the living God?

I could adduce the teſtimonies of many more reſpectable * Proteſtants, who have held opinions equally judicious on the ſubject, and will be bold to maintain that the greater part of your church, (I do not even exclude yourſelf) though they eſtabliſh, as they muſt do, the premiſes, viz. private judgment, are ſhocked at the concluſion, when they reflect on the fatal conſequences ariſing from it.

After ſaying, Sir, "you *believe* and *hope*," excellent grounds for an impeachment of ſuch

* Dr. Hare on the difficulty of reading the ſcriptures by private judgment. Likewiſe Jurien and Bayle have demonſtrated great learning requiſite, a knowledge of languages, ancient authors, fathers, &c. without which no one can be qualified to underſtand the literal ſenſe of many parts of ſcripture. Nay Bayle advanced that a greater knowledge of theſe things to be neceſſary, than can fall to the ſhare of any man. What pains did Origen and Jerome take in the ſtudy of languages for no other purpoſe.

magni-

magnitude, "that the Catholics are general-
"ly," which ſtill leaves it problematical,
"allowed the uſe of an Engliſh bible: it is
"much to be lamented, you add, that part
"only of the evil is removed; and that the
"public ſervice, in their congregations, is
"ſtill performed in a dead language. A
"tranſlation indeed is now, *I believe*, common-
"ly permitted; by which the abſurdity of
"the cuſtom is tacitly acknowledged, while
"unhappily the practice remains as before.
"Not to urge at preſent the manifeſt reaſon
"and propriety of the thing, it is truly won-
"derful that whoever reads St. Paul's firſt
"epiſtle to the Corinthians ſhould not per-
"ceive how repugnant this practice is to what
"he there teaches." 1 Cor. xiv. 14—17.
See the whole paſſage from verſe 2 to 28.
Give me leave, Sir, to repeat what I ſaid to
you before; viz. that you ought to aſcertain
the real value of things, before you hazard
opinions concerning them. When Latin was
firſt uſed in the liturgy of the catholic church,
it was the vulgar language in the moſt conſi-
derable part of the Roman empire. Even
in the remoteſt provinces it was the polite
tongue, as the French has been of late years.
So that the reaſon why the liturgy was per-
formed

formed in Latin, was on account of its being more generally known in the weſt, than any other language. No perſon of ſenſe can call it an *unknown* tongue at this day, as every man of the leaſt liberal education has ſome knowledge of it.

All paſtors are commanded by the council of Trent, ſeſſ. 24. cap. 7. upon days of worſhip to explain the liturgy, the commandments, and the ſcripture in the vulgar languages, and whatever may tend to the inſtruction and edification of the people. You may ſee, Sir, the decree at full length in the Catechiſmus *ad Parochos*. Be pleaſed to obſerve alſo that the council of Trent was held above 200 years ago, and therefore evidently overthrows your uncharitable inſinuation, if I underſtand it right, "that good ſenſe has at "length prevailed, and our brethren of the "Romiſh communion in this country are "generally I believe and hope allowed to underſtand what they are about during divine ſervice. An explanation ſurely is equal to a tranſlation. But the people have likewiſe tranſlations of the liturgy in all their prayer-books, one column in Latin, the other in Engliſh. It is likewiſe recommended to all paſtors to read the collects, epiſtles and

goſpels

goſpels to their congregations in the vulgar tongues, and whatever elſe may ſerve for the inſtruction and edification of the people, as I ſaid before.

Moreover, you cannot, Sir, ſuppoſe that the weſtern church, of which we are a part, is the only one which retains the ancient cuſtom of performing it in the primitive language. All the eaſtern churches do the ſame. Dr. Walton, in the prologomena to his Polyglot, ſays that whole churches in the eaſt have the cuſtom of performing their liturgy in an unknown tongue; ſo that, continues he, the common people do not underſtand the liturgies of Baſil and Chryſoſtom, which are publicly read in their churches. Cap. v. ſect. 1, 16. Edward Brerewood, a learned mathematician and antiquary, a member alſo of your church, exactly agrees with Dr. Walton. Speaking of the Greek church, he ſays, "The "difference is become ſo great between the "preſent and the ancient Greek, that their "liturgy yet read in the ancient Greek tongue, "namely that of Baſil on the Sabbaths and "ſolemn days, and that of Chryſoſtom on "common days, is not underſtood, or but "little of it by the vulgar people." The Jews likewiſe, in their ſynagogues and public

public offices in our bleſſed Saviour's time, either read the Hebrew or the Greek, neither of which was the vulgar language, but only the language of ſcholars; yet neither Chriſt nor his apoſtles ever complained of it. He even accommodated himſelf to this cuſtom. Luke iv. 16, 17, 18, 19. Dr. Pearſon, in his Expoſition of the 2d Article of the Creed, page 81. ſays, "that in the ſpace of ſeventy years "of the Babyloniſh captivity, the ordinary "Jews had loſt the exact underſtanding of "the old Hebrew before ſpoken in Judea, "and therefore when the ſcriptures were read "to them, they found it neceſſary to inter-"pret them to the people in the Chaldean "language, which they lately learnt," &c. See likewiſe Dr. Prideaux on the connexion of the hiſtory of the old and new Teſtament, vol. 4. p. 750, &c.

Hebrew, Sir, from the time of the captivity in Babylon, we ſee ceaſed to be the vulgar language, as both Jews and Chriſtians agree, and prove from Nehemiah viii. 8. "So they read in the book of the law of God "diſtinctly, and gave the ſenſe, and cauſed "them to underſtand the reading." In the Acts we find, xv. 21. that the Jews read Moſes every Sabbath day in their ſynagogues.

But to the unlearned it was explained, as the preceding text proves. Since then this was practiſed by the Jews, and we find that our bleſſed Saviour not only did not reprove the cuſtom, but even ſubmitted to it, (for ſurely the word of God does not loſe in its value by being explained and interpreted by thoſe guides and teachers he has ſet over us?) we may flatter ourſelves that we in no reſpect incur the cenſure of St. Paul, as ſtated by you.

Thus we ſee that in the primitive ages the liturgy was performed in the ſame language in the eaſtern and weſtern churches. If the liturgy however is not commonly underſtood now, as it was formerly, it is not that the church has made any alteration in its former language, or deſires that the public ſervice ſhould not be underſtood by the people, but becauſe all vulgar languages are ſubject to perpetual changes, as is manifeſt from the difference there is between our modern Engliſh, and what was ſpoken in the days of Chaucer. So that every nation (for be pleaſed to obſerve, Sir, that the catholic religion, as the name imports, is not confined and limited to one particular ſpot and country, but is, or has been the religion of every nation upon its converſion to chriſtianity;) if, I ſay, every

nation

nation then had laid aſide the Latin, and performed the ſervice in their own language, it would have undergone as many changes, as there have been in thoſe languages. Give me leave moreover to obſerve, that the language of the catholic liturgy does not appertain to the ſubſtance of that religion, any more than "the ſign of the croſs," which you ſay, p. 68. "in baptiſm is, as your church de-" clares, no part of the ſubſtance of that ſa-" crament."

After what has been ſaid, it is of little import to attend to the texts of St. Paul to which you refer, p. 6.; for whoever will read the whole chapter with attention, 1 Cor. xiv. may eaſily perceive that the apoſtle ſpeaks not of the liturgy, that is, of a ſet form of prayers, but only reprehends the abuſe of the gift of tongues, which ſome among the Corinthians were guilty of; who, out of oſtentation, affected to make exhortations, or extemporary prayers in the aſſemblies in languages utterly unknown, which for want of an interpreter could be no edification to the faithful. But this is far from being the practice of the catholic church, as I have already noticed. There all exhortations, ſermons, catechiſtical diſcourſes, &c. are delivered in the vulgar

languages, and the whole ſervice is explained and tranſlated for the uſe of thoſe who do not underſtand Latin, wherefore they are not without an *interpreter*, and conſequently are not included in the cenſure of St. Paul. Moreover, though it be granted that Latin is a *dead language*, as you ſay, yet in the ſenſe of St. Paul it cannot be called an *unknown* tongue, ſince there is no language in Europe more univerſally underſtood. The apoſtle ſpeaks of an *unknown* tongue. See verſes 4, 13, 14, 19, 27. If he ſpeaks not of miraculous gifts, one of which is ſpeaking in an unknown tongue frequently given to the people in thoſe days, there muſt be no common prayer in the church; neither muſt the extemporary prayer be made by the parſon only, but after the faſhion of the Quakers, women only excepted. "Let the prophets," ſays he, "ſpeak two or three, and let the "others judge. If any thing be revealed to "another that ſitteth by, let the firſt hold his "peace. For ye may prophecy one by one." Ver. 29, 30, 31. The whole chapter then refers to nothing but to exhortation and inſtruction of the people, and *extemporary* prayer addreſſed to them in an *unknown* tongue. That, and that only is forbidden; yet not abſolute-

ly,

ly, but with limitation, if there be *no interpreter.*

But, Sir, ſuppoſing the precept laid down by St. Paul in that chapter to be applicable to the liturgy and public ſervice, how can you exculpate thoſe *great and good men who reformed the* church, as you ſay, p. 1. for ſuffering the Iriſh parliament in Queen Elizabeth's reign to infringe that apoſtle's command? For I have read in Dr. Heylin's hiſtory of the reformation, p. 128, &c. that "the Iriſh parliament paſſed an act for uniformity of common prayer; with permiſſion of ſaying the "ſame in Latin, when the miniſter had not "the knowledge of the Engliſh tongue. But "for tranſlating it into Iriſh there was no "care taken. The people are required by "that ſtatute, under ſevere penalties, to frequent their churches, and to be preſent at "reading of the Engliſh liturgy, which they "underſtood no more of, than they do of "the maſs."

CHAPTER II.

On Tranſubſtantiation and Saint-worſhip.

This, Sir, is a very abſtruſe ſubject, and ſuch a one as I am little qualified to enter upon: for you muſt know that theological diſcuſſions could make no part of my education, farther than to teach me the duties of religion. However, as you have been pleaſed to deſire me *candidly* and *impartially* to weigh the topics you have written upon, I acquieſce willingly to your wiſhes, as ſilence might be attributed to ignorance, and your arguments deemed from thence unanſwerable. I ſhall therefore take the liberty to animadvert upon this chapter, as the periods preſent themſelves. And firſt upon the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation.

You enter upon it by ſaying, "that tranſubſtantiation alone, were there no other error in the church of Rome, would have made it neceſſary to leave her communion. "This ſtrange doctrine overturns the very "nature of a ſacrament." P. 8. Thus a doctrine received by the far greater part of the chriſtian

chriſtian world, and for upwards of 1500 years adopted by every chriſtian church without a ſingle exception, is ſtiled by you ſtrange and erroneous. You are free, Sir, to make what aſſertions you pleaſe, and ſo are we to inform you that you muſt not expect in matters of ſuch importance to be taken at your word. Were a Deiſt, or an Anti-Trinitarian to tell you that "the incarnation and the myſtery of "the Trinity alone, were there no other er- "rors in the chriſtian church, would make it "neceſſary for every man of common ſenſe "to leave her communion," would you not deem it unbecoming in him to advance ſuch haſty and unqualified aſſertions, unleſs he could ſupport them by evident and incontrovertible proofs? We have ſurely an undoubted right to expect the ſame from you. In lieu thereof we have nothing but bare aſſertions, or proofs, if ſuch they can be called, "which ſtand in need of other proofs to prove "them," to uſe your own words, p. 13, which you ſeem to have borrowed from Biſhop Burnet.

"If tranſubſtantiation is true," you ſay, "the elements are no longer viſible ſigns of "ſomething inviſible and ſpiritual." You mean that the bread and wine after conſecration

tion are no longer ſigns. Granted. What then? "But the ſymbol or ſign," you add, "is tranſmuted and changed into the thing "ſignified." You mean again that the bread and wine, in our ſyſtem, is changed into the body and blood of Chriſt. Granted. Therefore the very nature of a ſacrament, you ſuppoſe, is changed: therefore tranſubſtantiation is an error. This is ſtrange logic, and a method of reaſoning, which I dare ſay will not be generally admitted.

Inſtead of proving, you ſuppoſe principles, and then draw your own inferences from them, when you muſt know that your adverſaries with one accord reject thoſe principles as falſe and erroneous. For do you not ſuppoſe the * ſubſtance after conſecration to be the ſign, and of courſe the nature of a ſign requires it ſhould be a ſubſtance? Now all this every catholic denies; and you, Sir, do not prove, but ſuppoſe it. For the accidents of ſub-

* Subſtance is ſomething we conceive to ſubſiſt of itſelf, independently of any created being, or any particular mode or accident. Thus a piece of wax is a ſubſtance, becauſe we conceive it as ſubſiſting of itſelf, and in its own nature, without any dependence on any other created nature, or without any particular mode, form, or colour, &c.

ſtance,

ſtance, as extenſion, colour, &c. are more properly ſigns than ſubſtance itſelf, for a ſign is that which is immediately perceived by the ſenſes. Though the Holy Ghoſt appeared in the ſhape of a dove on account of the analogy between a dove and the Holy Ghoſt, it was not neceſſary that it ſhould be a real dove, but that it had the appearance of a dove. So the fiery tongues which appeared over the apoſtle's heads very properly ſignified the gift of tongues, on account of the analogy between the tongue and that gift. But then again thoſe tongues had not the ſubſtance of tongues, but only the appearance of them. Thus the * accidents, or appearance of bread may properly be a ſign of the body of Chriſt, on account of the analogy between bread and the body of Chriſt, though the ſubſtance of the bread is changed, inaſmuch as theſe accidents repreſent bread, which is wont to nouriſh.

"The Lord's ſupper," you ſay, "according to the words of the inſtitution, is to be "celebrated *in* remembrance of Chriſt; and

* Accidents in philoſophy are ſomething additional, or ſuperadded to ſubſtance; or not eſſentially belonging thereto, but capable, indifferently, either of being, or not being in it. See Locke on the human underſtanding.

"remembrance neceſſarily implies the ab-
"ſence of the thing remembered." Here again, Sir, you ſuppoſe a principle, which your adverſaries deny, inſtead of proving it. *Do this in remembrance of me*, which text you allude to from St. Luke, are not the words of the inſtitution, as you ſuppoſe; but, *this is my body*; *this is my blood*. To wave however this argument at preſent, *do this in remembrance of me* informs us indeed of the end for which we are to offer up, and receive the body and blood of Chriſt; viz. for a perpetual commemoration of his death and paſſion, according to what St. Paul ſays, 1 Cor. ii. 26. "For as
"often as ye eat this bread, and drink this
"cup, ye do ſhow the Lord's death till he
"come." But they no ways interfere with theſe other words, *this is my body*, *this is my blood*, ſo as to explain away the real preſence. Nay St. Matthew and St. Mark were ſo far from ſuppoſing the words *this do in remembrance* of me, to be an explanation of the other words *this is my body*, *this is my blood*, or as in any reſpect altering or qualifying the natural and literal ſenſe of them, that they both totally omitted them in their goſpels.

As for what you alledge, Sir, that "re-
"membrance neceſſarily implies the abſence
"of

"the thing remembered," cannot be admitted either as accurate or true; for whatever things we may be liable to forget, whether preſent or abſent, may be the object of remembrance. For example: What can be more intimately preſent to us than God, yet the ſcriptures command us to remember our Creator, "though "through him we live, move, and have our be-"ing." Wherefore this command of *remembering Chriſt* is no ways oppoſite to his real preſence in the ſacrament; but the moſt that can be inferred from it is, that he is not preſent in the ſame manner, and therefore leſt we ſhould forget him, this remembrance is enjoined. In a word, the ſacrament is to be celebrated in remembrance not only of Chriſt's death and paſſion, but of his life. And, pray Sir, cannot this be done, although we receive Chriſt himſelf, the more eſpecially under a veil? But, "here," you add, "is no ſenſible "repreſentation of a bleſſed body once viſi-"ble on earth, now exalted to heaven." You mean, Sir, there is no reſemblance between the ſign and Chriſt's bleſſed body; neither is it any ways neceſſary, for ſacraments are ſigns from the inſtitution of Chriſt, not from any natural or real connexion or reſemblance between the ſign and the thing ſignified. What

reſemblance for example, between pouring water and internal regeneration of infants in ſin, which you contend for, p. 39. againſt thoſe who ſeparated from your church? "But "the wafer," you add, "what was the wafer, "is literally that very ſame body preſent be- "fore our eyes." I muſt remind you, Sir, once more that you have no credit for your ſuppoſitions. You are only begging the queſtion.

"It is true," you add, "our bleſſed Lord "ſaid, *this is my* body; but ſo on another oc- "caſion, he ſaid, *I am the door*; and again, *I* "*am* the vine; and we may as well take his "words literally in one caſe as the other. "Scarcely any mode of ſpeech is more com- "mon in ſcripture, than to ſay, that the type "or figure is that which it ſtands for, or repre- "ſents." P. 9. Is it, Sir, a juſt way of reaſoning to infer that becauſe ſome of our bleſſed Saviour's words are to be taken figuratively, therefore all of them are to be ſo taken? At this rate a Socinian might pretend, that when in the ſcripture our bleſſed Saviour is called God, or the Son of God, it is only figuratively, becauſe in other places he is called the *vine*, and the *door*. There is a manifeſt diſparity between the expreſſions you mention,

I am

I am the door, I am the vine, and the words of the Lord's ſupper: *This is my body; this is my blood.* The former were delivered as parables, (John x. 6. xv.) and conſequently as figures. They are explained by Chriſt himſelf in a figurative ſenſe, and are of ſuch a nature as to carry with them the evidence of figures; ſo that no man can poſſibly miſtake them for ſuch. For who in his ſenſes will ever pretend to ſay that our bleſſed Saviour was really *a door* or *a vine?* But the latter, on the contrary, ſo evidently imply a literal ſenſe, that they who have been moſt deſirous to find a figure in them, have been puzzled to do it. This was the caſe of Luther himſelf, who, after all the pains he took, could never be reconciled to it. In his leſſer Confeſſion, he calls the authors of it "a damned ſect, "a pack of liars; curſed, proud and arro-"gant ſpirits, bread-eaters, wine-drinkers, "ſoul-murderers." And in his Theſes 28 he ſays, "We ſeriouſly think the Zuinglians and "all the ſacramentarian heretics, and ſepa-"rated from God's church, who deny the bo-"dy and blood of Chriſt to be taken with the "mouth of our body in the bleſſed ſacra-"ment." In his great Confeſſion de Cæna Domini againſt Zuinglius, Oecolampadius and others,

others he ſays, " Bread and the body of Chriſt " are ſo ſtrictly joined together that *they be-* " *come one and the ſame thing.* Per predica- " tionem identicam panis eſt realiter et pro- " prii Corpus Chriſti." He even confeſſes in the ſame book that *tranſubſtantiation may be allowed.* " Hactenus docui, et adhuc doceo, " parum referre, nec magni momenti quæſti- " nem eſſe, ſive quis panem in euchariſtiâ " manere, ſive non manere, et tranſubſtan- " tiari credat."

You ſay, Sir, that " our bleſſed Lord's mi- " racles were appeals to the ſenſes of thoſe " who were preſent; ſo that for inſtance, " when he turned the water into wine, the " very ſame ſight, the ſame taſte, that proved " what was put into the pots was water, proved " alſo that what was drawn out of the pots " was wine." Suppoſe that Chriſt's miracles were appeals to the ſenſes, muſt myſteries and ſacraments with their effects be ſo too? It was expedient in the beginning when Chriſt was about to publiſh his doctrine, that ſome of his miracles ſhould be manifeſt to the ſenſes; that they, who beheld them, might be induced to believe he was Chriſt, the Son of the living God; and he, by working ſuch *viſible* miracles, proved the divine authority of his word, and that he was worthy to be credited

dited, when he announced thoſe that were *inviſible*, or any other myſteries however impenetrable. Moreover as theſe *viſible* miracles were proper to *eſtabliſh* our faith, ſo *inviſible* miracles, and other myſteries are neceſſary to *exerciſe* it, when eſtabliſhed. We believe for example, as I have ſaid above, that a virgin conceived, not by human generation, but by the virtue and power of the Holy Ghoſt, which certainly is an *inviſible* miracle, and of courſe *no appeal* to the ſenſes. We believe the myſtery of the Trinity, viz. *theſe three are one*, becauſe it is a doctrine delivered by him, who wrought ſuch miracles as effectually proved his power was from above. By a viſible miracle he changed water into wine, and the conſequence was, as St. John tells us, ch. ii. 11. " his diſciples believed in him." All thoſe who are ſolicitous to believe what he taught, muſt ſubject their reaſon to faith, and reſt their faith, not on their ſenſes, as you inſinuate, but on the word of God. Thus you believe when it tells you that " the word was made fleſh;" and diſbelieve, though coming directly from the fountain of all truth, when he declares that " the bread which I ſhall give is my " fleſh." As the underſtanding may ſafely judge from the teſtimony of the ſenſes, when we have no reaſon to ſuſpect them, we readily

believe

believe the water and wine were the ſubſtances they appeared to be; and the natural conſequence is, that he who changed water into wine, can alſo change wine into blood. Although in this inſtance we may rely on our ſenſes, it does not follow that we are to be guided by them in all caſes.

"But here," you add, "a ſimilar and e-"qually miraculous change is effected, though "our ſenſes all the while atteſt there is no "change at all." I have already ſuggeſted to you, Sir, the danger of judging by the ſenſes alone, and ſhall ſoon have occaſion to ſhow that we are not in many ſimilar caſes to be guided by them. At preſent however I ſhall attend to what you ſo poſitively and erroneouſly advance. "Nay more there are two "miracles, as it has been juſtly obſerved, and "one of them is wrought to defeat the other. "For the elements are firſt of all converted "into the real body and blood of Chriſt; and "then by a ſecond miracle our ſenſes are im-"poſed upon, and what is verily fleſh ſeems "by every trial we can make to be bread as "before: as St. Paul clearly calls it after it "has been conſecrated." p. 10. That the elements are converted into the real body and blood of Chriſt we grant. But the ſecond miracle, which you are pleaſed to advert to,

is

is of your own growth. It owes its birth to the habit you ſeem to have contracted of making falſe ſuppoſitions, and drawing your own concluſions from them. The ſenſes, as I have taken the liberty to tell you, repreſent immediately their proper object, viz. the accidents of ſubſtance, ſuch as colour, ſhape, &c. and therefore of courſe they are not impoſed upon. Wherefore there is no need, as I obſerved, of your ſecond miracle.

"And what is verily fleſh" you ſay, "ſeems by every trial we can make to be "bread as before." Only add, Sir, by every trial we can make except reaſon guided by the clear word of God, and we agree. Our ſenſes indeed are commonly the medium of true information, but in no caſes the judges; judgment being an act of the underſtanding. Nevertheleſs in ſome caſes the ſenſes are not even proper mediums or true informers, being often deceived both in natural and ſupernatural things. For inſtance, our ſight gives us falſe information concerning the magnitude of the celeſtial bodies. The ſun appears to us no bigger than a plate, or a ſtar larger than a ſmall diamond, when at the ſame time our reaſon tells us that they are confeſſedly larger than the whole earth. The ſenſes, as I have

obſerved, give a wrong information concerning the divinity of Chriſt, as alſo of him who appeared to the woman at the ſepulchre. For they took him for a man, Mark xvi. 5. though the ſcripture ſays he was an angel, Mat. xxii. 2. If you reply it was ſtill a man, I anſwer it was not that man the appearances exhibited. An appeal then to the ſenſes about the ſubſtance of objects is proper, when we have no reaſon to ſuſpect a ſupernatural interference. But when we are told that God himſelf interferes in it, it is fruitleſs. Faith muſt then correct the information, for to ſay that we would ſooner believe our ſenſes than God is blaſphemous.

" But St. Paul", you ſay Sir, " clearly calls " it bread after it has been conſecrated." True. And nothing can be more conſonant to the common practice of mankind, and to the rules of ſpeech; firſt, becauſe it has to our ſenſes all the natural appearance of bread. For this reaſon, angels in ſcripture are called men, becauſe they appeared as ſuch. Joſhua v. 13. Luke xxiv. 4. Acts i. 10. &c. Secondly. Becauſe it was bread before conſecration. Thus God ſaid to Adam " Duſt thou art, and unto " duſt ſhalt thou return." Aaron's rod which was changed into a ſerpent, Exod. vii. 10. was

ſtill

ſtill called a rod, v. 12. becauſe converted from it. Thirdly. It is called bread, the bread of life, the ſpiritual food, and nouriſhment of the ſoul. But St. Paul no where determines what he ſays, by your quotation, to natural bread. On the contrary he ſays, after mentioning the cup, "the bread which we break, "is it not the communion of the body of "Chriſt?" Then he proceeds thus, "Let a "man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of "that bread and drink of that cup. For he "that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth "and drinketh damnation to himſelf, not diſ-"cerning the Lord's body." xi. 28, 29. Surely it never could be ſaid of a bit of bread and a ſup of wine, that he who eats and drinks it unworthily, eats and drinks perdition to himſelf. Such puniſhments and rewards (for of thoſe who eat and drink worthily, it is ſaid they ſhall live for ever) cannot relate to the eating and drinking after that manner. Whence ſome of the diſciples called it a *hard ſaying; who can bear it?* John vi. 60. and thereupon left our bleſſed Saviour; who, turning to the twelve, ſaid "Will you alſo go away? Then "Simon Peter anſwered him, Lord to whom "ſhall we go? Thou haſt the words of eter-"nal life. And we believe and are ſure that

"thou art that Chriſt, the Son of the living "God." ib. 67, 68, 69. The twelve then were far from calling it a *hard ſaying*; though Chriſt at that time promiſed to leave them his fleſh and blood to eat and drink, and therefore expreſſed no aſtoniſhment at it when he performed that promiſe at his laſt ſupper.

You have heard, Sir, how oppoſite Luther was in opinion to your figurative ſenſe. Probably you may begin to think that there is ſome diſparity between the texts *(This is my body*, &c. and I am the *door* and the *vine)* you have quoted. To make the diſtinction more evident, previous to any inference I ſhall draw, permit me to lay down a principle which you muſt allow; viz. that whatſoever Chriſt has plainly and expreſsly ſaid in ſcripture ought to be underſtood in the literal and proper ſenſe of the words, where the caſe will admit of it; otherwiſe it will not be poſſible to prove by ſcripture that any one text of the goſpel ought to be taken literally. Now it is certain that our bleſſed Saviour has plainly and expreſsly ſaid that what he inſtituted at his laſt ſupper, was the ſame body and blood which he gave and ſhed for us; and there is nothing in the literal ſenſe which can oblige us to have recourſe to a figurative meaning,

becauſe there is nothing in the belief of the real preſence, but what is clearly and evidently within the ſphere of infinite power. So the apoſtles conceived it, when Simon Peter replied to his bleſſed Maſter in the name of his brethren, as related above. Hence Whitaker againſt Reyner, p. 192, ſays, "that Chriſt can "make the bread his body, we grant." Jewel againſt Harding, p. 352. declares that "God, "by his omnipotence, is able to make Chriſt's "body preſent without place or quanti-"ty." The divines of Wirtemberg ſay, "We believe that God by his omnipotent "power is ſo great that in the euchariſt "he may either annihilate the ſubſtance "of bread, or elſe change it into his body." p. 454. The reſult is, that the text, *This is my body*, &c. is to be taken in the obvious and literal ſenſe of the words. Thus you would reaſon, Sir, on the text, "The word is made "fleſh." John i. 14.

Moreover Chriſt was at that time making a covenant, which was to laſt to the end of the world. He was diſcovering a high myſtery of faith. He was inſtituting a ſacrament, which all were commanded to receive. Finally he was making, as it may be ſaid, his laſt will and teſtament, and therein bequeathing to

his

his diſciples, and to us all, a divine legacy and pledge of his love. In ſuch circumſtances he undoubtedly intended to be rightly and thoroughly underſtood. Of courſe he made uſe of terms the moſt clear and plain in their obvious and natural ſenſe. To ſuppoſe he would have done otherwiſe, is to impeach his wiſdom.

You ſaid however, Sir, that "ſcarcely any "mode of ſpeech is more common in ſcrip-"ture, than to ſay, that the type or figure is "that which it ſtands for or repreſents." p. 9. When a ſign is already known to be a ſign or figure of ſomething elſe, which it ſignifies or repreſents, it may indeed according to the ordinary mode of ſpeech uſed in ſcripture, be ſaid to be ſuch or ſuch a thing, as in the interpretation of parables, ancient figures and the like. But it is not the ſame in the firſt inſtitution of a ſign or figure, becauſe when a thing is not known beforehand to be a figure or ſign, or repreſentation of ſomething, to call it abruptly by a foreign name would be contrary to all the laws of ſpeech, and be obſcure and unintelligible; as if you ſhould ſay that a morſel of bread is Middleton church, becauſe at the moment you ſhould think of that building. Juſt ſo it would have been if our bleſ-

ſed

ſed Lord at his laſt ſupper, without previouſly acquainting his diſciples that he deſigned to ſpeak figuratively, ſhould have abruptly told them *This is my body; this is my blood*, had he not meant that it was really ſo. For, abſtracting from the change Chriſt was pleaſed to make in the elements by his almighty power, a bit of bread has no more ſimilitude to the body of Chriſt, than Middleton church. So that nothing but the real preſence of Chriſt's body and blood could verify his words, and vindicate them from being highly abſurd, and conſequently unworthy of him.

"Nor is this ſtrange notion", you ſay, "of the euchariſt only repugnant to plain "ſenſe and to the word of God; it has alſo "given riſe to many ſuperſtitions. One of "theſe is the adoration of the hoſt; which, "if this doctrine is not true, appears to be "little better than abſolute idolatry." p. 10. A Socinian Sir, would readily retort the argument upon you. "If Chriſt be not God, "you are an idolater." Though we were miſtaken in the queſtion of tranſubſtantiation, yet how can you imagine that adoring Chriſt in the ſacrament would be idolatry, unleſs Chriſt be an idol, which it is blaſphemy to think? This Dr. Jeremy Taylor, a clergy-

man

man of your church, Sir, thought to be a demonſtration. "Idolatry", he ſays, "is a for-
"ſaking the true God, and giving divine wor-
"ſhip to a creature, or to an idol, that is, to
"an imaginary God.— Now it is evident,
"that the object of the catholic's adoration
"in the bleſſed ſacrament, is the only true and
"eternal God, hypoſtatically joined with his
"holy humanity; which humanity they believe
"actually preſent under the veil of the ſacra-
"mental ſigns. And if they thought him not
"preſent, they are ſo far from worſhipping the
"bread in this caſe, that they themſelves pro-
"feſs it idolatry to do ſo. Which is a *demon-*
"*ſtration* that their ſoul has nothing in it, that
"is idolatrical; the will has nothing in it, but
"what is a great enemy to idolatry; and no-
"thing burns in hell, but proper will." Liber-
ty of prophecying, ſect. 20. numb. 26. Mr. Thorndike, another proteſtant clergyman, is poſitively of Dr. Taylor's opinion. "For
"will any papiſt", ſays he, "acknowledge that
"he honors the elements of the euchariſt (or
"as he thinks the accidents of them) *for God?*
"*Will common reaſon charge him to honor that,*
"*which he believes not to be there?*—He that
"worſhips the hoſt, believes our Lord Chriſt
"to be the only true God, hypoſtatically u-
"nited

" nited to our fleſh and blood. Which being " preſent in the euchariſt in ſuch a manner, " as it is not preſent every where; there is due " occaſion to give it that worſhip in the eu- " chariſt, which the Godhead in our manhood " is to be worſhipped with, upon all due occa- " ſions. Thus we ſay he was worſhipped in " the ancient church, that believed the ele- " ments to be preſent; and they were no ido- " laters." Juſt weights and meaſures, chap. 19. p. 125, 126.

If you have, Sir, any regard for the doctrine and practice of the primitive church, as you muſt have if you mean to refute thoſe who ſeparated from your church, you yourſelf, as it appears to me, have adduced an incontrovertible argument, p. 40. to confute at one ſtroke all the cavils you have made againſt * tranſubſtantiation. Speaking of infant-baptiſm, you ſay, " Thoſe fathers who lived in the

* This word was affixed to that doctrine by the council of Lateran anno 1215, to expreſs the ancient faith of the church relative to the myſtery of the bleſſed euchariſt, as was the word *conſubſtantial* firſt made uſe of by the council of Nice in the year 325 to expreſs unequivocally the divinity of Chriſt againſt the Arians. That is not making a new article of faith, but only affixing a new word to aſcertain beyond cavil the ancient doctrine.

" next age after the apoſtles, ſhew that infant-
" baptiſm was then in uſe. Other early writers
" expreſsly inform us that the apoſtles baptiſed
" infants."

I anſwer then in your own words, only ſubſtituting the word tranſubſtantiation for infant-baptiſm. " Thoſe fathers', I ſay, " who " lived in the next age after the apoſtles ſhew " that the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation was " the faith of the church. Other early writers " expreſsly inform us of it." Firſt then I appeal to Ignatius, who, you ſay, " was the diſ-
" ciple of St. John, a man in all things like un-
" to the apoſtles." p. 85. If ſo, (of which however there can be no doubt) he certainly knew what was the doctrine of the apoſtles. Let us then attend to what he ſays on the ſubject before us. " They (ſays he, ſpeaking of " the heretics of his time) do not admit the " euchariſt and oblations; becauſe they do " not confeſs that *the euchariſt is the fleſh of our* " *Saviour Jeſus Chriſt*, who ſuffered for our " ſins." Epiſt. genuin. ad Smyrnos, edit. Voſſius, p. 5.

You quote likewiſe St. Juſtin, p. 23. and elſewhere. You ſay that he wrote about the year 140 after Chriſt. Juſtin then expreſſes himſelf on the euchariſt in the following manner.

ner. "We call", says he, "this nouriſhment "the euchariſt, and no one is permitted to par- "take of it, unleſs he believes the truth of our "doctrines, has been baptiſed unto remiſſion "of ſins and newneſs of life, and lives confor- "mably to the precepts of Chriſt Jeſus. For "we take not theſe as common bread and com- "mon drink; but as Jeſus Chriſt our Saviour "being incarnate by the word of God, had "both fleſh and blood for our ſalvation; ſo "we are taught, that this food, by which our "our fleſh and blood are nouriſhed, over "which thanks have been given by the prayers "in his own words, *is the fleſh and blood of the* "*incarnate Jeſus.*" Apol. ii. p. 38. Edit. Pa- ris.

To theſe high authorities of the ſecond and third age, give me leave to ſelect three more of the fourth century. St. Cyril, pa- triarch of Jeruſalem, writes thus on the ſame ſubject. "Jeſus Chriſt in Cana of Galilee "changed water into wine by his will only. "And can we not believe him that *he changed* "*the wine into his own blood?*—Let your ſoul "rejoice in the Lord, being perſuaded of it, "as a thing moſt certain, that the bread which "appears to our eyes *is not bread*, though our "taſte do judge it to be ſo, but that it is the

" body of Jeſus Chriſt. And that the wine, " which appears to our eyes *is not wine*, though " our ſenſe of taſte takes it for wine, but that " it is the blood of Jeſus Chriſt." Colect. myſtag. c. 4.

Gregory, biſhop of Nyſſa in the year 372, delivers his opinion on the ſame ſubject in the following manner. " Bread, to uſe the words " of the apoſtle, is ſanctified by the word of " God and prayer. Not ſo, that it is to be " changed into the body of Chriſt by nouriſh- " ing it; *but that it is ſuddenly changed into it* " *by theſe words, this is my body; the nature of* " *theſe things that appear, being transelemented* " *into it by the power of conſecration.*" In orat. Catech. cap. 37. t. 3. Edit. Paris.

St. Ambroſe was archbiſhop of Milan in the fourth century alſo. He ſays, " If Elijah's " words were able to draw fire from heaven, " will not Chriſt's words *be able to change the* " *ſpecies of the elements?* We read of all crea- " tures in the world, *he ſaid, and they were* " *made; he commanded, and they were created.* " Is not then the word of Chriſt, which could " give a being to that which had none, *able to* " *change thoſe things which are, into what they* " *were not before?* For it is not leſs *to give new*

" *natures*

" *natures to things, than to change their natures.*" Lib. de initiatis.

I ſhall not trouble you, Sir, with more authorities on this ſubject, having produced the ſentiments of two Greek and one Latin father, only for brevity ſake, though I could have appealed to the writings of a cloud of witneſſes. I ſhall now revert to what you have moreover ſaid, Sir, in page 40. " How ſo " great an alteration, as the introduction of " infant-baptiſm (the doctrine of tranſubſtan- " tiation I aſſert) could never take place with- " out being obſerved, and oppoſed, and re- " corded if it had not exiſted in the begin- " ning."

Very true. For the thing is without example. The hiſtories of every conſiderable hereſy, ſuch as that of the Arians, Neſtorians, Eutychians, Monotholites, Pelagians, Donatiſts, Novatians, &c. &c. which have cauſed great diſturbances in the church, have been written; and we know how, where, and when they began; what progreſs they made, what reſiſtance they met with, and many other particulars. To ſuppoſe then that the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation crept into the church without being perceived, or oppoſed by any body

body for ſeveral hundred years, is not to be credited.

Moreover, the thing will appear altogether impracticable, if we conſider how watchful the church has always been in diſcovering every hereſy, and how vigorous in oppoſing the growth of it. So that many have been ſuppreſſed at their very appearance, as Quietiſm was in the laſt century in France. And it is an undeniable truth, that the church has always exerted herſelf with the ſame watchfulneſs and vigour in all ages, without the leaſt regard to the dignity or character of the perſons, who by miſtake, or otherwiſe, endeavoured to corrupt the purity of the chriſtian faith. Thus, though Tertullian and Origen were two great pillars of the church in their time, and their orthodox writings are juſtly valued by all men of learning, yet the church was watchful enough to diſcover the tares that grew up with the wheat; and the reputation neither of their wit or learning could ſave their errors from being condemned. The ſame may be ſaid of ſome errors held by Lactantius, Arnobius, Caſſianus, and others, which could not eſcape the watchful eye of the church, and were accordingly cenſured by her. Nay, what is ſtill more remarkable, the error of St.

Cyprian,

Cyprian, who was a man of extraordinary character, was oppoſed and underwent the ſame fate. So true it is, that the church has always been extremely jealous of the purity of her faith; watchful in detecting the leaſt error againſt it, and inflexible in doing juſtice upon it. Is it then poſſible that the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation, was it an error, could creep into the church without being perceived; and if perceived, without being immediately oppoſed and condemned?

You add, Sir, in the ſame place on infant baptiſm, "We know when a different practice "began, and how ſtrenuouſly it was condem-"ned on it firſt appearance. The eſtabliſhed "uſage of the church (to baptize infants) "would have experienced the like oppoſi-"tion, had it been an innovation." Ibid.

But no oppoſition ever was made to the doctrine of tranſubſtatiation till about the days of Berengerius in the eleventh century. No ſooner did he broach this novel doctrine, which cauſed great confuſion in the church, than it was condemned by eleven provincial councils both in Italy and France. Nor did the Greek church accuſe them of any error for ſo doing, which evidently proves that they taught the ſame doctrine as the Latins

in

in that reſpect. To put it beyond a doubt that there never was a difference between the two on the ſubject of tranſubſtantiation, we need only recollect that when Cyrillus Lucaris denied it among the Greeks, he was preſently anathematized by two different councils held at Conſtantinople in 1639 and 1642, as Berengerius had been condemned by eleven different councils in the Greek church, as aboveſaid. See Arnaud's perpetuitè de la foy.

"There are two kinds of idolatry," you are pleaſed to ſay, Sir, "forbidden by the ſe-
"cond commandment and other parts of the
"holy ſcripture. The firſt is making any
"image or likeneſs whatſoever of the Al-
"mighty; the other is paying divine worſhip,
"either with or without an image, to any real
"creature or imaginary being. It is very
"difficult to acquit the church we relin-
"quiſhed of either of theſe grievous er-
"rors. They allow their painters and ſculp-
"tors to repreſent the eternal Father, *whom*
"*no man hath ſeen, nor can ſee*; who is a pure
"ſpirit, every where preſent, and filleth all
"things. And in the homage which they of-
"fer to the bleſſed Virgin and other ſaints, it
"ſeems impoſſible to ſay they are clear of the
"other,

" other, and, if poſſible, groſſer idolatry. It
" is true, they ſay, the reſpect does not ter-
" minate in the material image, is not tender-
" ed to it, but through it to the Being repre-
" ſented. The very ſame, *doubtleſs*, any ido-
" latrous Jew or Pagan would have ſaid in de-
" fence of their worſhip. When Aaron had
" made the calf, the Iſraelites ſaid, *Theſe be*
" *thy Gods, O Iſrael, which brought thee up out*
" *of the land of Egypt.* The moſt ſtupid among
" them could not poſſibly believe the image
" of gold, which was not made till that day,
" was the very Being who had ſome months
" before brought them out of Egypt. They
" meant, it was a ſymbol or repreſentation of
" that Being; and ſo did Aaron, when he
" made an altar before it, and ſaid, *To-morrow*
" *is a feaſt to the Lord; to Jehovah the true and*
" *living God.* Jeroboam's wickedneſs, which
" he is for ever branded as having made Iſ-
" rael to ſin, was preciſely the ſame. He re-
" preſented God by an image, and that like
" Aaron's, a golden calf or ox. The intro-
" duction of falſe Gods was the ſin whereof
" Ahab was guilty; which is carefully diſtin-
" guiſhed from that of Jeroboam, and ſpoken
" of as ſtill more heinous: for *as if it was a*
" *light thing for him to walk in the ſins of Jero-*

"*boam*,—he went—and ſerved Baal." P. 10, 11, 12.

"There are two kinds of idolatry forbid-"den by the ſecond commandment." In the 16th verſe of the ſame chapter, I add, it is forbidden alſo to "bear falſe witneſs againſt "thy neighbour." "The firſt," you ſay, is "making any image or likeneſs whatſoever of "the Almighty..... They (the Catholics) "allow their painters and ſculptors to repre-"ſent the eternal Father," &c. They do ſo. And, pray Sir, does not your church allow your painters to repreſent the Holy Ghoſt under the form of a dove? I have one of your common prayer books before me, printed at Oxford in 1700, in which are two different pictures of the Holy Ghoſt, as he appeared in that ſhape. Where then is the harm of repreſenting the Father in the likeneſs of an old man, when he appeared to the prophet Daniel as ſuch*? Surely the Holy Ghoſt is as truly God, as the Father. And if it be lawful to paint or engrave the Holy Ghoſt like a dove, which I ſee your church makes no ſcruple to do, how can it be unlawful to repreſent the Father as an old man. Be pleaſed to ob-

* Daniel vii. 9.

ſerve

ſerve however that we deem it unlawful and forbidden, to ſuppoſe that any corporeal figure can be a *true* repreſentation of the Deity.

Your next charge, Sir, againſt the Catholics reſpects the homage they pay to the bleſſed Virgin. But as you repeat it in the following page, not to treſpaſs too much upon your time, I will defer my remarks upon it for a moment. You have been pleaſed to ſay that they (the Catholics) affirm "the re-"ſpect does not terminate in the material "image," &c. "The very ſame," you add, "any idolatrous Jew or Pagan would have "ſaid in defence of their worſhip." And to prove your aſſertion, ſuch, you ſay, was the idea of Aaron and the Iſraelites. I rather think, Sir, the texts of ſcripture will not warrant the concluſion you draw, nor will it ſtand the teſt of profane hiſtory. Permit me to remind you of a few paſſages in both. In the xxxii. chapter of Deuteronomy, ver. 15. we read, "He (Iſrael) *forſook* God which made "him." In verſe 18. "had *forgotten* God "that formed him." In Pſalm cvi. 19, &c. it is ſaid, "They made a calf in Horeb, "and worſhipped the molten image. Thus "they changed their glory into the ſimilitude "of an ox that eateth graſs. They *forgot*

"God their Saviour." In the Acts we read likewiſe that Stephen, anſwering his accuſers, ſpoke in the following manner to the Jews: "Our fathers would not obey, but *thruſt* him "(the true God) from them, and in their "hearts *turned back* again into Egypt, ſaying "unto Aaron, Make us Gods to go before us. "..... And they made a calf in thoſe days, "and offered ſacrifice unto the idol, and re-"joiced in the work of their hands." vii. 39, 40, 41. Now, Sir, to ſuppoſe that the Jews only meant to adore the true God under the ſimilitude of a calf is a flat contradiction to the aboveſaid texts. Moſes ſays, and repeats it twice, that they *forſook God*. The Pſalmiſt aſſerts that they *forgot God*. Stephen likewiſe tells the Jews that they *thruſt God* from them, and in *their hearts* turned back into Egypt. If it be true then that they meant what you are pleaſed, Sir, to ſuppoſe, it muſt be falſe that they *forgot him*, and *thruſt him* away from them. But if it be true that they *forgot him*, and *thruſt him* away from them, as the text plainly imports, then it could not be that they meant to worſhip him under any form whatever. Becauſe in that ſenſe it could not be ſaid that they either *forgot him*, or *thruſt him* away from them. Moſes, ſpeaking of this very

very act of idolatry, says, "they provoked "him with *strange* Gods." Deut. xxxii. 16. The God of Israel cannot be called a *strange* God. "They sacrificed unto devils, not *to* "*God.*" Ver. 17. Shall we then conclude, Sir, that they sacrificed to the true God? Such a conclusion would not only be contrary to the express words of these texts, but to the following also. "They sacrificed to Gods "whom they *knew not*; to *new* Gods that "came *newly* out." Ibid. What can be more clear, and precise? David says, "They *for-* "*got* God, their Saviour, which had done "great things in Egypt." Psalm cvi. 19. Strange indeed it was that all those wonders should have been so soon forgotten! But it is for the hardness of their hearts that God so often censures them. So that Moses with great reason wondered how Aaron could be brought to accede to their demands, and become an accomplice in their sin. Moses, in his astonishment, asked him, "What did this "people unto thee, that thou hast brought so "great a sin upon them?" Exodus xxxii. 21. Aaron, in excuse, pleaded the violence offered to him.

"The most stupid among the Jews," you say, "could not possibly believe that the "image,

" image, which was not made till that day, " was the very being who had brought them " out of Egypt." Why ſo, Sir, when ſcripture tells us quite the contrary? Were they wiſer or leſs prone to idolatry than their ſucceſſors? Let us attend to what Iſaiah ſays on the ſubject. " He (Iſrael) maketh a God, and " worſhippeth it; he maketh it a graven image, " and falleth down thereto." And again: " The reſidue thereof he maketh a God, even " his graven image: he falleth down unto it, " and worſhippeth it, and prayeth unto it, and " ſaith, Deliver me; for *thou art my God.*" Chap. xliv. 15, 17. In the prophet Jeremiah, ii. 26, 27. we read, " As the thief is " ſhamed when he is found: ſo is the houſe " of Iſrael aſhamed; they, their kings, their " princes, and their prieſts, and their pro- " phets, ſaying to a ſtock, *Thou art my Father,* " and to a ſtone, *Thou haſt brought me forth. . .*" So far for ſacred hiſtory. Let us now attend to what profane hiſtorians relate on the ſubject.

Minutius Fælix, ſpeaking on this ſubject, ſays: " Behold an idol is caſt, it is worked, it " is hewed; it is not as yet a God. It is " leaded, it is fixed, it is ſet up; it is not yet " a God. It is adorned, it is *conſecrated,* it is

" *prayed*

"*prayed to*; then *it is a God.*" "Quaſi ſalam "conſecratione mutaverit," as Tertullian ſays, Apol. cap. xii. p. 13. Thus the philoſopher, Arnobius, ſays of himſelf, "I lately reveren-"ced, O blindneſs! ſtatues taken from the "furnace, Gods hammered on the anvil ..... "as if it had a ſacred virtue, I flattered it; I "ſpoke to it; I made requeſts *to an unthinking* "ſtock." Lib. 1. contra Gentes. Stilpon, the philoſopher, being baniſhed Athens for denying that Minerva was a God, excuſed himſelf by ſaying ſhe was a Goddeſs, and not a God. "Deam non Deum eſſe." Heraclitus was driven from Epheſus for daring to ſay that their Gods were only ſtocks and ſtones. So were the philoſophers Protagoras, Diagoras, Anaxagoras, and many others for the ſame cauſe. Thus we ſee that not only the Jews, but the Pagans themſelves, many of whom have been eſteemed for their learning and wiſdom, were *ſtupid* enough *to believe* that ſtocks and ſtones could deliver and protect them.

Moreover, could a doubt be formed of what the generality of the Pagans thought on the ſubject, we need only refer to the Acts of the Apoſtles, (xix.) where we find that they reproached St. Paul at Epheſus, as a blaſphemer, for ſaying that they be no "Gods,

" Gods, which are made with hands." V. 26. Horace, more wiſe than moſt of his countrymen, ridicules the very ſame idea in the following manner:

" Olim truncus eram ficulnus, inutile lignum,
" Cum Faber incertus ſcamnum faceretne Priapam,
" Maluit eſſe Deum, Deus inde ego."

Lib. 1. Sat. 8.

In Engliſh thus:

" In days of yore, our Godſhip ſtood
" A very worthleſs log of wood.
" The joyner doubting; or to ſhape us
" Into a ſtool, or a Priapus.
" At length reſolved, for reaſons wiſe,
" Into a God to bid me riſe."

Tranſlated by Francis.

It may not be amiſs to examine whence this miſconception concerning the adoration of images, as it is called; this prejudice againſt Catholics in conſequence of it, ariſes. Biſhop Godwin obſerves, as Mr. Collier relates, Eccleſ. Hiſt. vol. 2. b. 2. p. 149. that " Henry VIII, was ſtrongly diſpoſed to pro-" mote a reformation that would turn the pen-" ny, and furniſh the exchequer." For this end he confiſcated the monaſtic lands. In the ſame manner, and for the ſame purpoſe, the

the Duke of Somerſet and his party in the ſubſequent reign ſtripped the churches of what was called their unneceſſary furniture. Images and pictures of Chriſt and his ſaints were included in the general proſcription, and being often of value, to palliate the ſacrilege they were deemed objects of ſuperſtition. Though the effect has paſſed by, (for ever ſince the churches in general are as naked as a barn) the principle remains. It is inculcated to youth from the earlieſt dawn, that retaining images in churches is contrary to the law of God, and that the Papiſts, as they are pleaſed to call them, for ſo doing are idolaters. As they grow up, this prejudice grows up with them. It is not therefore to be much wondered at if on entering any catholic church, where they will ſee ſuch things, the prejudice ſhould be confirmed. Now permit me to aſk you, Sir, if Catholics on the other hand were abſurdly, and, I may ſay, ſo erroneouſly taught that Proteſtants adore the lion and the unicorn (for little elſe is to be ſeen in the generality of churches in this country, and men in high eſtimation with the world have adored beings full as abſurd, as you know) might they not be confirmed in the reality, when they viſit thoſe places of worſhip? Would any cenſure be

ſufficiently ſevere againſt thoſe who ſhould imbibe and retain ſuch ſenſeleſs ideas? Certainly not. For the wiſe man ſhould examine firſt, and afterwards form his opinion.

O prejudice, to falſehood near allied,
Thou ſtubborn child of ignorance and pride!

If we attend however a little to the nature and diſpoſition of mankind, we ſhall find that images and pictures of holy things are almoſt as neceſſary as preaching and oral inſtruction. Three fourths of the people are ignorant, ſtupid, and hard of underſtanding. The greater part of them cannot read. Wherefore images and pictures are to their eyes, what words would be to their ears; with this difference, that what ſtrikes the former makes a greater impreſſion, than what is received through the medium of the latter. It is what common ſenſe plainly indicates, and was judiciouſly remarked by a heathen poet 1800 years ago.

" Segnius irritant animos demiſſa per aurem,
" Quam quæ ſunt oculis ſubjecta fidelibus."

Ars. Pœtica, p. 234.

In Engliſh.

" ———— What we learn
" With weaker paſſion will affect the heart,
" Than when the faithful eyes behold the part."

Francis' tranſlation.

No

No doubt but this idea, congenial to common ſenſe, was one motive which induced the catholic church to retain them in their churches. But at all times ſhe was careful to explain the real uſe they are intended for. This Mr. Weaver, in his Eſſay on Funeral Monuments, fully exemplifies. He tells his readers that uſually under the image or picture of Chriſt in all the abbey-churches before the reformation, were written the following lines:

" Effigiem Chriſti dum tranſis ſemper honora,
" Non tamen effigiam, ſed quem deſignat adora
" Nam Deus eſt quod imago docet, ſed non Deus
" ipſa:
" Hanc videas, et mente colas quod cernis in illa."

In Engliſh thus:

" Chriſtian! to this the image of thy Lord,
" Let due reſpect, in paſſing by be paid;
" But let him only be adored,
" Whoſe agony is here pourtray'd.
" For he is God, and not this work of art;
" This view—but him adore and love with all thy
" heart."

This in every reſpect is perfectly conformable to the doctrine of the catholic church, explained in the catechiſm, which the children have always been taught, and are taught at this day.

"The invocation of the bleſſed Virgin "and other ſaints we are told," you are pleaſed to ſay, Sir, "is not praying to them, but "only deſiring them to pray for us. Ad- "mit this for a moment. The practice is "then, like that which the apoſtle condemns, "*a voluntary humility and worſhip*, warranted "by no precept, countenanced by no exam- "ple in the Old or New Teſtament." Col. ii. 18.

Who would not imagine, after ſo dogmatical an aſſertion, that the invocation of ſaints and angels, that is, deſiring a part in their prayers, is clearly condemned by St. Paul, and that his words are not ſuſceptible of any other meaning, than as you are pleaſed to underſtand them. Now, Sir, I ſhall endeavour to prove not only that your interpretation of the words of St. Paul is incorrect, but your peremptory aſſertion that the practice *is not warranted by any example in the Old or New Teſtament*, is equally ſo. I prove it from a principle, which I think cannot be conteſted, viz. that the ſaints and angels in heaven do pray for us. Firſt from Zachariah, where an angel thus prays for Jeruſalem and the cities of Judah. "Then the angel of the Lord an- "ſwered and ſaid, O Lord of Hoſts, how long "wilt

"wilt thou not have mercy on Jeruſalem and "on the cities of Judah, againſt which thou "haſt had indignation theſe threeſcore and "ten years." Chap. i. ver. 12, 13. What can be called praying, if this is not?

Secondly, I prove it from the maxim of St. Paul himſelf, viz. "that charity never "ceaſeth." 1 Cor. xiii. 8. That is, though faith and many other virtues ceaſe in heaven, as being inconſiſtent with the ſtate of bliſs, yet charity, by which we love God above all things, and our neighbour as ourſelves, not only remains, but is undoubtedly increaſed in heaven. And therefore if charity in this world obliges us to be ſolicitous and pray for one another's ſalvation, ſurely the angels and ſaints in heaven, whoſe charity ſurpaſſes ours by many degrees, cannot fail of performing their part in ſending up their prayers to the throne of grace for thoſe who are yet combating in the warfare of this mortal life, and uncertain of their future ſtate.

This argument is admirably well handled by Mr. Thorndike in his Juſt Weights and Meaſures, chap. xvi. p. 107, where he diſcourſes thus: "All members," ſays he, "of "the church triumphant in heaven according "to their degree of favor with God abound "alſo

"alſo with love to his church militant on "earth.... therefore it is certain both that "*they offer continual prayers to God* for its ne- "ceſſities, and that their prayers muſt be of "great force and effect with God for the aſſiſ- "tance of his church militant in this warfare. "Which if it be true, the communion of ſaints "will neceſſarily require, 1ſt, That all.... "&c. 2dly, That *the living beg of God a part* "*and intereſt in their prayers, which they who* "*are ſo near to God in his kingdom tender him* "*without ceaſing for the church upon earth.*"

I ſhall not trouble you, Sir, with any more quotations on this ſubject, but refer only to the collect in your common prayer-book upon the day of St. Michael and all the angels. Your church hopes, by that prayer, for *ſuccour* and *defence* from angels. I infer therefore from this principle that it is but conſiſtent with common ſenſe to requeſt a part and intereſt in thoſe prayers, which, by God's own appointment the ſaints and angels offer to him without ceaſing for the church militant upon earth. Can we poſſibly believe that our angel-guardian, for example, prays for us, and yet think it unlawful to deſire his prayers? Can we hope for *ſuccour* and *defence* from angels, and at the ſame time believe that

it

it is condemned by St. Paul; if we beg of them that *ſuccour* and *defence*, for which Almighty God has appointed them to be our guardians?

The ancient Fathers, being convinced that the ſaints and angels did pray for them, made no ſcruple to requeſt their prayers. This is a fact of too great notoriety to require many proofs. I ſhall therefore adduce the teſtimony of ſuch only as are acknowledged by proteſtants themſelves.

Beza (pref. novi teſtament.) ſpeaking of the times of St. Cyprian, Auguſtin and Chryſoſtom, acknowledges that then prevailed the *invocation of ſaints*. The centuriſts charge St. Chryſoſtom's liturgy with *invocation of our bleſſed* Lady by name. Cent. v. c. 16. col. 675. And again, they alledge ſeveral examples of prayers to ſaints in Athanaſius, Baſil, Nazianzen, Ambroſe, Prudentius, Epiphanius and Euphremius. Cent. iv. col. 295. Laſtly Mr. Thorndike writes thus. "It is confeſſed that "the lights both of the Greek and Latin "church, St. Baſil, St. Gregory Nazianzen, "St. Ambroſe, St. Jerom, St. Auguſtin, St. "Chryſoſtom, St. Cyril of Jeruſalem, St. Cy-"ril of Alexandria, Theodoret, St. Fulgen-"tius, St. Gregory the great, St. Leo, more,

"or

" or rather all after that time have ſpoken to " the ſaints, and deſired their aſſiſtance*." In Epil. part 3. p. 358.

This, I think Sir, is abundantly ſufficient to prove that the invocation of ſaints was both taught and practiſed by the greateſt lights of the church in thoſe very ages when ſhe was moſt eminent both for holineſs and learning. The fact is ſo clear, that it is acknowledged, as we ſee, by proteſtants themſelves. It proves likewiſe the impropriety of your interpretation of St. Paul to the Coloſſians. For it follows from it by a manifeſt and undeniable conſequence, that all theſe ancient fathers which the world has held in veneration both for their holineſs and learning, practiſed that " volun- " tary humility and worſhip which, you ſay, " the apoſtle condemns, is warranted by no " precept, countenanced by no example in the

* When Vigilantius, in the year 404 denied the interceſſion of ſaints, St. Jerome replied " If the apoſtles and " martyrs prayed for others in this world, when they were " in concern for themſelves, how much more after their " crowns, victories and triumphs? Moſes obtained pardon " for ſix hundred thouſand men. Stephen requeſted " pardon for his perſecutors. And ſince they are with " Chriſt, will they have leſs power?" Lib. contra Vigilantium.

" old

"old or new teſtament." I am very confident that you never reflected upon the conſequence of your aſſertion, and therefore ſhall take the liberty to give you another interpretation of his words. The principal ſubject of that chapter of St. Paul to the Coloſſians is to eſtabliſh the divinity of Chriſt, his ſuperiority over the angels, and mediatorſhip between God and man. "In him", he ſays, "are hid all the treaſures of wiſdom and "knowledge. v. 3. For in him dwelleth all "the fulneſs of the Godhead bodily; and ye "are compleatin him, which is the head of all "principality and power." v. 9, 10. Whence the apoſtle takes occaſion to warn the Coloſſians againſt the pernicious [doctrine of thoſe who taught that it was not Chriſt but angels, who were our mediators and reconcilers with God, whom he therefore juſtly accuſes of *not holding the head*, which is Chriſt, and of a *voluntary humility and worſhip*.

This, Sir, is the commentary which St. Chryſoſtom has made upon theſe very words. "They" (ſays he, ſpeaking of thoſe againſt whoſe ſeduction St. Paul precautions the Coloſſians) "affirm that we ought to be reconcil-"ed to God, not by Chriſt, but angels" In Epiſt. ad Col. 2. 68. Which blaſphemous

doctrine the apoſtle calls a *fleſhly* and *carnal* thought, and *an intruding into things we have not ſeen.* He likewiſe, according to your reference, calls it a falſe and affected *humility* in ſubmitting themſelves to thoſe as their *mediators* and *reconcilers* to God, who are utterly incapable of that high office. When therefore you can prove, Sir, that the requeſts which catholics make to the ſaints and angels to obtain a ſhare in their prayers, is the ſacrilegious worſhip you have deſcribed; that is, when you can prove them guilty of taking away the mediatorſhip from Chriſt, and of giving it to angels and ſaints, it will be then, and then only, that you can with any propriety apply to them the abovementioned text of St. Paul.

But " were I even certain", you ſay, "(which I never can be without an expreſs "revelation to aſſure me) that the ſaint whom "I addreſs hears the words I utter, or knows "the ſecret aſpirations of my heart, is it cre-"dible, or conceivable that the ſame ſaint "hears the vows of ten thouſand other ſup-"pliants, poured forth at the ſame inſtant in "different parts of the earth, unleſs the ſaint "poſſeſſes the incommunicable attributes of "God, is every where preſent, and knows all "things." p. 13.

Indeed

Indeed, Sir, I am aſhamed to notice this period. Surely if the ſaints and angels know what is doing here on earth, they likewiſe hear the prayers which are addreſſed to them? That they are not ignorant of the former may be proved by various texts of ſcripture, and the latter is but a natural conſequence which flows from it. I have already quoted the firſt chapter, verſe 12 of Zachariah, wherein we find that the angel is praying to the Lord for mercy on the people of Jeruſalem and the cities of Judah. The angel then was well informed of their neceſſities, and his prayers, according to the next verſe, were accepted; for "the Lord anſwered him with good and "comfortable words." In Jeremiah xv. 1. we read the following text. "Then ſaid the "Lord unto me, tho' Moſes and Samuel ſtood "before me, yet my mind could not be to-"wards this people." By which manner of ſpeech it appears that Moſes and Samuel long ſince dead, after their deaths did not ceaſe to pray for the people, and that their prayers were moſt powerful. The prophet Daniel had equal merit and power with God, as we find in Exekiel xiv. 14. "Though theſe "three men, Noah, Daniel and Job were in

"it (the land of wickedneſs) they ſhould de-
"liver but their own ſouls by their righteouſ-
"neſs." Joining thus Daniel, then living, with Noah and Job who had been dead ſo many hundred years before, plainly proves that theſe men by their prayers no leſs powerfully interpoſed themſelves than Daniel living. We read that Elijah departed this life in the xviii year of king Jehoſophat, 2 Kings xi. 11. Now Jehoſaphat reigned xxv years. 2 Chron. xx. 31. ſo that ſeven years paſſed after the departure of Elijah. Then Jehoram his ſon reigned in his ſtead. 2 Chron. xxi. 1. After ſome time that Jehoram had reigned, "there
"came a writing to him from Elijah the pro-
"phet, ſaying, thus ſaith the Lord God of
"David thy father, becauſe thou haſt not
"walked in the ways of Jehoſaphat, thy fa-
"ther:" v. 12. And then he tells him many particular wicked acts of his; all done after Elijah was dead. Elijah therefore being departed, knew what paſſed, and ſhewed his great care to help God's people, his brethren, in writing this letter after he had quitted the world.

Let us now turn to the new teſtament. And firſt to St Luke, "I pray thee", ſaid the rich man to Abraham, "that thou wouldſt
"ſend

"ſend to my father's houſe: for I have five "brethren: that he may teſtify unto them, "leſt they alſo come into this place of tor- "ment." xvi. 27, 28. What motives ſoever moved the rich man to pray to Abraham, as above, the ſame motive will induce the ſaints in heaven to help us in our neceſſities. That they do ſo, we read in the 5th chapter of the Revelation. "And when he had taken the "book, the four beaſts and four and twenty "elders fell down before the Lamb, having "every one of them harps, and golden vials "full of odours, which are the prayers of the "ſaints." v. 8. Which prayers made by ſaints on earth, theſe ſaints in heaven did know, and hear, for they preſented them in *golden vials*. And chapter 8, we read that "another angel "came, and ſtood at the altar having a golden "cenſer: and there was given unto him much "incenſe, that he ſhould offer it with the "prayers of all ſaints upon the golden altar, "which was before the throne. And the "ſmoke of the incenſe, *which came* with the "prayers of the ſaints, aſcended up before "God out of the angel's hand," 3, 4. It is evident therefore that the angel being before the throne of God, did there hear the prayers of the ſaints on earth. Secondly. He

did

did not only hear their prayers, but alſo *offered them up* before the throne of God in a golden cenſer, which he could not have done, if he had not known them. Thirdly. Theſe prayers of the ſaints on earth, by being thus jointly offered by the more fervent prayers of the ſaints in heaven, or holy angels, did become more acceptable to God, for hence " the " ſmoke of the incenſe with theſe prayers aſ- " cended out of the angel's hand." You may now poſſibly, Sir, find it both *credible and conceivable that the ſame ſaint hears the vows of ten thouſand ſuppliants.*

We are moreover informed by the new teſtament that " there is joy in the preſence of " the angels of God over one ſinner that re- " penteth." Luke xv. 10. No act however is more hidden from us than the ſincere converſion of a ſinner. Exterior acts, ſuch as weeping, ſighing, groaning, &c. may be done by hypocrites. The angels then who rejoice at the converſion of a ſinner, cannot know this converſion, unleſs they can dive into the ſecret receſſes of the heart. Again St. Luke tells us, that though " there was a great gulph " between the ſouls of Abraham and the rich " man," xvi. 26. yet God gave them ſome means to hear what each other ſaid. Can he then

then find no means for ſaints to hear us. Could Abraham hear the rich man from hell, and can he not hear thoſe from earth who pray to him? Moreover "Abraham ſaith unto him (the rich "man) They have Moſes and the prophets." v. 29. Moſes and the prophets however lived many years after Abraham was dead, and yet we ſee that Abraham knew that there were ſuch men, who left ſuch books behind them to the Jews. Secondly. He knew thoſe books extant. Thirdly. That theſe writings of theirs were of no leſs efficacy to convert the rich man's five brothers, than the preaching of a man riſen from the dead would be. You poſſibly may ſay, Sir, that this is a parable. Granted. But nevertheleſs the interlocutors muſt be made to ſpeak ſenſe, and not nonſenſe; as it would be, if, for example, Julius Cæſar was made to diſcourſe with Alexander the great about things they had ſeen in Oliver Cromwell's time, who lived ſo many centuries after them.

We know for certain, Sir, that the ſaints departed are in heaven, where they ſee God face to face. We likewiſe know for certain (and it is a truth acknowledged by your church, as I have already ſhown) that the ſaints and angels, who are the church *triumphant*,

phant, pray for the church *militant*, which is upon earth. Whence it follows, 1, that our deſiring a part in their prayers cannot be unprofitable, as long as we are ſure it is known to God, though the ſaints and angels ſhould know nothing of it. The reaſon is, becauſe as it is an articles of our belief, that all bleſſings flow originally from *God alone through Jeſus Chriſt*, ſo in the deſires and language of the heart, it is only to *God through Jeſus Chriſt* that all our prayers are directed; without which they could not ſtrictly be prayers. Whence it follows 2dly, that it is the ſame in effect whether we ſay "Holy Peter pray for "us", or whether we pray thus, "O God "grant us a ſhare in the prayers of St. Peter." As it was the ſame in David to ſay "O praiſe "the Lord all ye nations..' Pſalm cxvii. 1. as if he had ſaid "O Lord, may all nations praiſe "thee." And in conſequence, tho' it were true that the ſaints and angels know nothing of our invoking them, it is enough, that it be known to God, when we deſire them to pray for us, that is, to have a ſhare in their prayers. I have already ſhewn you what the ancient fathers thought on the ſubject. They made no ſcruple to invoke the ſaints, and exhort others to do the ſame: nor had they any difficulty

culty to believe that, as the prophets could foreſee, and ſee things at a diſtance by the mere light of grace, ſo the ſaints in heaven may do the ſame by the light of glory. This does not however prove that they conſequently *know all things*, as you expreſs yourſelf. For, though they ſhould know facts paſt, preſent, and to come, this knowledge would ſtill be limited as thoſe things are, and by conſequence come infinitely ſhort of the infinite knowledge of God, who not only knows all things paſt, preſent, and to come; but every thing that is poſſible. Suppoſe however that the ſaints and angels do not know *all things*, is that a reaſon why they do not hear our prayers? It would be beyond preſumption to ſay that God cannot communicate to his ſaints the knowledge of our petitions either immediately by himſelf, or mediately by the miniſtry of our angel-guardians, who certainly know both our neceſſities and prayers, as has been ſhewn.

You ſay, Sir, that you "are not ignorant "of what is ſaid in behalf of this doctrine." If ſo, why did you not ſpeak out, and give us ſome new lights on the ſubject by controverting it. Inſtead of that you give us an unintelligible jingle of unmeaning words, which

require all your ingenuity to explain. You are pleaſed to ſay that "it is only an attempt "to eſtabliſh one poſition that requires proof "by another that requires proof, with this "diſadvantage, that, as we apprehend, it can "never be proved; for it is not taught in "ſcripture, and is repugnant to reaſon." p. 13. What, Sir! have I adduced no texts of ſcripture to ſupport that doctrine? If I have, that doctrine is taught in ſcripture. Nor is it repugnant to reaſon, as you ſay, unleſs you deem all the ancient fathers and many of the reſpectable clergy of your own church irrational beings. Here I might cloſe the ſubject, did I not wiſh to aſk you if the 7th chapter of St. Luke be ſcripture? For in that chapter you will find the whole foundation on which the devotion of catholics to the bleſſed Virgin is grounded, though you are pleaſed to inveigh againſt it and condemn it with your uſual inaccuracy. What do you think, Sir, of the angel's ſalutation. "Hail, thou art "highly favored, the Lord is with thee." Luke i. 28. which is the moſt ſublime panegyric that ever was made on a pure creature. What do you think of the words of Elizabeth, who "was filled with the Holy Ghoſt. And "ſhe ſpok with a loud voice, and ſaid *bleſſed*

"*are*

"*are thou amongſt women....?*" Luke i. 42, 43. Laſtly, Sir, what do you think of the bleſſed Virgin's own prophetic words? "For "behold from henceforth all generations ſhall "call me bleſſed." Ver. 48. This ſurely may be deemed a plain prediction of the honor and reſpect, which the church would pay to her through all ages. Strange! that our bleſſed Lord ſhould foreſee the abuſes which would creep into the world, as you inſinuate, on account of his mother, and yet inſpire the evangeliſts to write things of her which muſt give us the higheſt idea of her dignity and merits; and is, as I ſaid, the foundation of all that reſpect and veneration which is paid to her.

"They," (the Catholics) you ſay, "uſed "certainly to implore of the bleſſed Virgin "help and protection, and ſalvation." P. 13. They do ſo ſtill, without the leaſt fear of giving her a particle of that honor which is due to God alone. But pray Sir, do you not, when you recite the collect, which your church preſcribes, do the ſame? I preſume that the bleſſed Virgin is a ſaint in heaven. And do you not implore both *ſuccour* and *defence* from the angels on St. Michael's day. And what is meant by *ſuccour* and *defence*, but that they

will by their prayers aſſiſt you in attaining ſalvation? Is not that *imploring ſalvation?*

We know however that the bleſſed Virgin is but a creature, and therefore it would be blaſphemy to think that ſhe could in any reſpect help or aſſiſt us independent of her Son. Yet Dr. Pearſon, whom you quote in your firſt page, was not afraid to ſay, "We cannot "bear too reverend a regard to the Mother "of our Lord ſo long as we give her not that "worſhip, which is due unto the Lord him-"himſelf." (On the Creed, p. 179.) "Let "her be honored and eſteemed," ſays St. Epiphanius; "let him be worſhipped and a-"dored." Hæreſis 79. ſect. 7. The church ſurely is the beſt and ſole interpreter of the true ſenſe of her doctrine, and ſhe has ſufficiently declared that in what form ſoever her prayers to the ſaints are expreſſed, ſhe means no more than to implore their interceſſion to the *Giver of* all *good gifts*. So that when we deſire the bleſſed Virgin to *help*, *comfort*, or *deliver* us from ſin, or bring us to *eternal life*, the true meaning is that we only deſire her to obtain for us thoſe bleſſings of God through the mediation of Jeſus Chriſt; which words conclude, or are meant to conclude every prayer made either to her or the ſaints.

You

You proceed. "And when, as the cuſ-
"tom ſtill is abroad, a perſon ſuſpends a taper
"before the image of the holy Virgin, or
"ſome other ſaint, and falling down on his
"knees, with his hands elevated and his eyes
"fixed on the image, utters a formal prayer,
"this ſurely is ſolemn adoration. It is ren-
"dering to the ſtatue that homage which
"would not be due to the ſaint himſelf, were
"he perſonally preſent; that reverence which
"the beloved diſciple would have paid to the
"angel, had he not been forbidden. (Revel.
"xix. 10.) It is in ſhort honoring the crea-
"ture, equally with the Creator: for there is
"no poſture *more devout* than kneeling, where-
"with I can preſent myſelf before the living
"God." P. 13, 14.

If there is no poſture, Sir, *more devout*, and if kneeling be giving the worſhip to creatures, which is due to God alone, then children kneeling to aſk their parent's bleſſing, (which they generally uſed to do, till theſe degenerate days) are guilty of idolatry. Kneeling to the king, or bowing to the chair of ſtate is implicated in the ſame cenſure. I have already told you that Catholics deem it blaſphemous to give *any part* of the honor due to God either to the bleſſed Virgin or the ſaints, and

therefore

therefore they are not guilty of any act of idolatry, either with or without a taper. I ſhall therefore proceed to notice your text from St. John, which I rather think, upon due inveſtigation, will make againſt yourſelf. To ſtate the ſubject more clearly it may be neceſſary to revert to the 3d chapter, verſe 9th of the Revelation. "Behold I will "make them come and worſhip before thy "feet." Theſe words are ſpoken to the angel of Philadelphia. It may be ſaid that by this angel, the biſhop of Philadelphia is underſtood. Be it ſo. We may then worſhip before the feet of the chief biſhop of the church; and ſtill with greater propriety, we may worſhip before the feet of thoſe who have a far greater excellency in virtue, grace, and glory, as ſaints have above all men upon earth. For according to St. Matthew, "he that is leaſt "in the kingdom of heaven is greater than "he;" (chap. xi. 11.) that is, greater than the great St. John Baptiſt was upon earth; though of him Chriſt himſelf ſaid, "Verily I "ſay unto you, Among them that are born of "women there hath not riſen a greater than "John the Baptiſt." Ibid. St. John the Evangeliſt then knowing it to be true which he himſelf had written, that "Chriſt would make

"men

"men come, and worſhip before the feet of "the angel of Philadelphia," thought it his duty to adore before the feet of any angel; and hence he ſays of himſelf, Revel. xix. 10. "And I fell at his feet to worſhip him." And again, "I fell down to worſhip before the "feet of the angel, which ſhowed me thoſe "things." Chap. xxii. 8. You inſinuate, Sir, that at each of thoſe adorations the angel checked St. John, ſaying, "See thou do it "not; for I am thy fellow-ſervant .... wor-"ſhip God." To this it may be anſwered, that if the firſt adoration uſed by St. John had been of its own nature idolatrous and ſinful, which cannot be credited as coming from ſo great a prophet; yet at leaſt being told ſo, and inſtructed by the angel to the contrary, he would never have been guilty of attempting a ſecond time that impious and ſinful act both wittingly and willingly; and this ſo very ſoon after he had been cautioned not to do it. It was not therefore by reaſon of any unlawfulneſs in this action, which made the angel refuſe the worſhip of St. John, but out of ſingular reſpect unto him, whom he knew to have been admitted to lie on the boſom of our bleſſed Saviour at the laſt ſupper, and whom he knew alſo to be a prophet and evangeliſt.

Where-

Wherefore he ſaid, "See thou do it not; for "I am thy fellow-ſervant," and thou art either greater in God's ſight than I am, or ſoon may come to be far greater. *Worſhip God*, who hath ſo magnified thee. Yet St. John's humility working ſtill more upon him by ſeeing the angel ſo humble, was ſtill more impreſſed with his own inferiority, reflecting on what he was himſelf, and knowing what his divine Maſter had ſaid, viz. that "the leſſer "in the kingdom of heaven was greater than "the great St. John Baptiſt," according to the preſent ſtate. He therefore did the ſecond time ſhow the angel that honour, which he knew was due to him.

Theſe things happened when St. John was in baniſhment in the iſland of Patmos; Revel. i. Whence it is manifeſt that he uſed both theſe two ſeveral adorations, twice worſhipping the angel, long after St. Paul had written to the Coloſſians, (ii. 18.) which you, Sir, ſo deciſively appealed to, p. 12, as condemning the practice of the catholic church in worſhipping, that is, in deſiring a part in the prayers of the ſaints and angels; which doctrine, we may modeſtly ſuppoſe, St. John to have underſtood. And therefore muſt have thoroughly known that in adoring or worſhipping

ping the angel twice as he did, he neither of thoſe times acted contrary to the injunctions of St. Paul. Catholics may therefore adore angels, as St. John did, and yet not infringe the caution which St. Paul gives to the Coloſſians. If they are guilty, St. John was equally ſo in doing it long after St. Paul's epiſtle had been written. In fine: In whatever ſenſe St. Paul is to be underſtood, it cannot be in a ſenſe forbidding any thing contrary to that which St. John did; and which, with him, the catholic church practiſes. But the fact is, St. Paul only ſpeaks of ſuch religious worſhip of angels, as had been taught among the Jews by Simon Magus, who would have ſacrifice offered to both good and bad angels. See Epiphanius Hæreſis 25. Chryſoſtom. Hom. 7. and condemned by the council of Laodicea.

In page 108 you tell your readers, that "the church of Rome," you ſhould have ſaid the catholic church, for the church of Rome is only a part of it, "withholds one half of "the Lord's ſupper from the people, the o-"ther half being perverted and adored *, we "were

* You ſay Sir, "Since the firſt part of this tract was "printed, I have been informed, that many Roman Ca-

"were obliged to come out of her." The latter part of your aſſertion, Sir, has been already

"tholics at preſent maintain, that in the maſs the bread is "changed, not into the fleſh of Chriſt, but into his ſpiri- "tual body. This alters, but does not at all leſſen the "abſurdity. There are ſtill two miracles; and the ſecond "is wrought, as far as we can judge, for no other ima- "ginable reaſon, but to defeat the firſt, and to impoſe "upon our ſenſes. For if the bread is really changed "into the very body of Chriſt, whether it be his fleſhly "or ſpiritual body, all the benefits derivable from eat- "ing that body could not but attend it as well and as "fully, if it *appeared* to our ſenſes to be that body, as "now that it is aſſerted *to be* that body, but confeſſedly "*does not appear* to be, Beſides, in addition to the con- "tradictions of the common hypotheſis, there are ſome "obvious abſurdities peculiar to this notion of the tran- "ſubſtantiation of the bread into Chriſt's ſpiritual body. "For in this view, when our Lord inſtituted this bleſſed "ſacrament, the bread was converted into his ſpiritual "body *before his ſpiritual body, as ſuch, had any exiſt- "ence;* for at that time *Jeſus was not yet glorified.* John "vii. 39. On this ſuppoſition alſo there is no correſ- "ponding ſubſtance for the element of wine to be chan- "ged into. For St. Paul teaches us that the reſurrec- "tion body, glorified humanity, will not conſiſt of fleſh "and blood: 1 Cor. xv. 50. And ſuch as our body "ſhall be, ſuch is now the *glorious body* of Chriſt our Re- "deemer, Phil. iii. 21. Surely, ſurely, into whatever "ſhape ingenuity may torture tranſubſtantiation, thoſe "who aſſert it deceive themſelves as well as others,

"and

ready anſwered, therefore I ſhall not trouble you with a repetition of it. The former part of

" and do not really believe even when they affirm they " do, this terrific and portentous doctrine." P. 109.

I muſt ſay, Sir, that you are not at all indebted for the information you received, ſince it has led you into ſome palpable errors. Indeed you ſhould have known that change is no feature in the catholic church. What ſhe held in doctrinal matters in 95, ſhe now holds in 1795. Catholics always did, and do at this day believe they receive in the euchariſt " the fleſh and blood of the incar- " nate Jeſus," as St. John ſays, according to thoſe words of our Saviour, " he that eats my fleſh and drinks my " blood ſhall live for ever;" though you were pleaſed civilly to give us the lie. When they call it a ſpiritual body, thoſe words, ſpiritual body, are taken in the ſenſe of St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 44. who calls a body as it exiſts on earth a *natural* (or as the Vulgate renders it an animal, or earthly) body, corpus animale; and as it ſhall exiſt in heaven a *ſpiritual* body; that is, a body endowed with thoſe qualities that render it like a ſpirit; but not a ſpirit. When they ſay they receive in the euchariſt the fleſh and blood, they denote the reality of Chriſt's body; and when they call that body a ſpiritual body, they denote *the manner* in which it exiſts. This does not change their faith, but explains it. " There are ſtill two mira- " cles," you ſay; " and the ſecond is wrought, as far " as we can judge, for no other imaginable reaſon, but " to defeat the firſt, and to impoſe upon our ſenſes. For " if the bread is really changed into the very body of " Chriſt, whether it be his fleſhy or ſpiritual body, all

of it then ſhall, with your leave, be the ſubject of our preſent diſcuſſion. But may I aſk you

" the benefits derivable from eating that body could " not but attend it as well and as fully, if it had *appear-* " *ed* to our ſenſes to be that body, as now that it is aſ- " ſerted *to be* that body, but confeſſedly *does not appear* " to be."——" There are ſtill two miracles," you ſay, " the ſecond wrought only to defeat the firſt." This has been anſwered before, (ſee page 40.) But ſuppoſing there were twenty, as I ſaid before, what would that be to the purpoſe? And if the ſame benefits were to accrue in one manner as fully as the other, pray is not the Almighty at liberty to chuſe which he pleaſes? " For who " hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been " his counſellor?" as St. Paul ſaid to the Romans, chap. ii. 34. Abſtracting from the will and pleaſure of God, though the ſame benefits ſhould attend the receiving him as fully in one manner as the other, would the convenience or inconvenience be the ſame? To determine which of the two ways of receiving him would be the moſt convenient, and ſuited to our circumſtances, viz. in his proper human ſhape or under a ſacramental veil, requires a very ſmall portion of diſcernment indeed!—But you are moreover miſtaken. There are valuable benefits peculiar to the mode of receiving him under a veil. For we have thereby a fair opportunity of exerciſing our faith; and by the appearances being preſerved, we are not ſhocked at the thoughts of eating his fleſh, as the unbelieving diſciples were. And did we not receive him thus, we might exclaim, as they did, " how " can this Man give us his fleſh to eat?"

" Beſides

you which half of the Lord's ſupper is with-held from the faithful? Surely it is not a dead

"Beſides in addition," you tell us, "to the contra-
"dictions of the common hypotheſis, there are ſome ob-
"vious abſurdities peculiar to this notion of the tran-
"ſubſtantiation of the bread into Chriſt's ſpiritual body.
"For in this view, when our Lord inſtituted this bleſſed
"ſacrament, the bread was converted into his ſpiritual
"body *before his ſpiritual body, as ſuch, had any exiſtence;*
"for at that that time Jeſus was not glorified. (John
"vii. 39.) On this ſuppoſition alſo there is no correſ-
"ponding ſubſtance for the element of wine to be chan-
"ged into. For St. Paul teaches us that the reſurrec-
"tion body, glorified humanity, will not conſiſt of fleſh
"and blood: (1 Cor. xv. 50.) And ſuch as our body
"ſhall be, ſuch is now the *glorious* body of Chriſt our
"Redeemer." (Phil. iii. 21. Since you ſeem, Sir, to-
tally to miſunderſtand the text, it is not ſurpriſing your inference from it ſhould be as abſurd, as it is erroneous. Though Jeſus was not yet glorified, and his body ſpiritualized, pray Sir, was it beyond the ſphere of his omnipotence to change bread into his body, and that his body ſhould exiſt ſpiritualized under the ſacramental veil? Unleſs you aſſert this, which I preſume you will not, your argument is abſurd. I ſay *you will not*, becauſe in that caſe you would not only contradict your church doctrine, but the opinion of the beſt of your divines. In Dr. Coſin's hiſtory of tranſubſtantion we read, "That
"God's omnipotency can change one ſubſtance into a-
"nother, none will deny. And we ſee it done by Chriſt
"in the town of Cana, in Galilee, when he changed
"the

dead, but the living body of Chriſt which we *verily and in deed* receive, as your catechiſm teaches.

" the water into wine." (P. 117.) The church of England's doctrine concerning the words of the inſtitution, according to the Doctor, (whatever may be the opinions of ſome of its members) is this: " Theſe words " of Chriſt, *This is my body*, ſignify; this to the worthy " receiver, conveys my body *truly, really, and ſubſtan-* " *tially:* ſo theſe words of Chriſt, *This is my blood*, ſig- " nify; this to the worthy receiver, conveys *my blood* " *truly, really, and ſubſtantially.*" And becauſe it is inconceivable how the body and blood of Chriſt, which is only in heaven, ſhould be *really* and *ſubſtantially* preſent to the ſoul and body of the receiver upon earth (though not received by the mouth, p. 44.); therefore the church of England, if the Doctor gives us a true idea of her doctrine, grants that this is an *incomprehenſible myſtery.* " We believe," ſays he, " a preſence and union of Chriſt " with our ſoul and body, which we know not how to " call better than ſacramental, that is effected by eat- " ing; that, while we eat and drink the conſecrated " bread and wine, we eat and drink therewithal the bo- " dy and blood of Chriſt; not in a corporal manner, " but in ſome other way incomprehenſible, known only " to God, which we call ſpiritual." " We confeſs," he adds, " with the fathers, that this manner of preſence is " *unaccountable*, and paſt finding out; not to be ſearch- " ed, and pried into by reaſon, but believed by faith." (Ibid.) You may remember alſo the teſtimonies I have already adduced from Whitaker, Jewel, the divines of Wirtemberg, all ſubſcribing to the ſame opinion. You

ſay,

teaches. Now a living body cannot be without blood, nor the blood of a living perſon be

ſay, Sir, "On this ſuppoſition (before Chriſt's body was "ſpiritulized and glorified) alſo there is no correſponding ſubſtance for the element of wine to be changed "into." Juſt as much, Sir, as for the element of bread. You proceed. "For St. Paul teaches us that the reſurrection body, glorified humanity, will not conſiſt of "fleſh and blood: (1 Cor. xv. 50.) and ſuch as our body ſhall be, ſuch is now the glorious body of Chriſt "our Redeemer." (Phil. iii. 39.) As you ſeem to miſunderſtand the text, it is not ſurpriſing your inference ſhould be erroneous. The words of the text at full length are theſe: "Now this I ſay, Brethren, that fleſh "and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." And you reaſon thus: "The reſurrection body will not conſiſt "of fleſh and blood, but the glorious body of Chriſt is "now the ſame as our bodies ſhall be in heaven." Therefore the body of Chriſt, as you inſinuate, does not conſiſt of fleſh and blood; of courſe his fleſh and blood is not in the euchariſt. So far your argument. Does this however correſpond with the laſt chapter of St. Luke? Therein we read that Chriſt appearing, after his reſurrection, with the ſame body with which he aſcended into heaven, ſaid to them, (the apoſtles), "Behold my "hands and my feet, that it is I myſelf. *Handle* me, "and ſee: for a ſpirit hath not fleſh and bones, as ye "ſee me have." (V. 39.) Fleſh and blood, Sir, I preſume does not ſignify, as you ſuppoſe to my aſtoniſhment, the ſubſtance of fleſh and blood, but their corrupt qualities,

be without his body. Therefore by conſequence we receive Chriſt whole, and entire, whether we receive under one or both kinds. For the body and blood of Chriſt are inſeparable, nor is it poſſible to receive the one without the other, both body and blood being contained under one kind. As long then as the people receive the ſacrament in either kind, they fully obey the command of Chriſt in receiving his body and blood, which is all that is commanded. You will, I believe Sir, be puzzled to find any poſitive precept to prove that the laity are obliged to receive it in both kinds. The apoſtles indeed were, and in them all biſhops and prieſts, deriving their ordinations from them.

ties, as depraved paſſions, evil inclinations, and ſo forth. St. Jerome, explaining theſe words, ſays, "*fleſh* and "*blood* in the ſcriptures often ſignify the works of the "fleſh, and in proof quotes theſe words of Chriſt to his "apoſtles, *now ye are not in the fleſh, but in the ſpirit.*" This ſubject ſeems to require no further elucidation, therefore I ſhall drop it, and leave you to reconcile what you ſay (not St. Paul) "the reſurrection body will not "conſiſt of *fleſh and blood*," with this article of the Apoſtles' Creed, *I believe the reſurrection of the fleſh.* As to the manner Chriſt operates in the euchariſt, we leave to his omnipotence, and bow ſubmiſſion to the word of God, admiring his goodneſs in the inſtitution of it.

Public

Public communions alſo in both kinds were allowed in the primitive church, yet in many inſtances ſhe deviated from that practice. It cannot therefore be ſuppoſed that the church in her pureſt days would have violated and reverſed the poſitive commands of Chriſt, had ſhe thought them ſuch, on any pretence whatever. She muſt have known that adminiſtering half a ſacrament is a ſacrilege, which no neceſſity can excuſe. It was therefore the undoubted judgment of the primitive church, that adminiſtering the ſacrament in one or both kinds is a matter of diſcipline only. For the faithful were permitted during the perſecutions to carry the conſecrated hoſt to their houſes, but not the conſecrated wine, as we read in Tertullian, and Cyprian de Lapſis. They were likewiſe permitted to adminiſter the ſacrament to the ſick in the ſame manner as Euſebius informs us in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, lib. vi. cap. xliv. p. 200. St. Ambroſe received it himſelf in the ſame manner on his death-bed, as is recorded in his life. From theſe undeniable inſtances of communion in one kind practiſed by the primitive church, it certainly was her judgment, 1ſt, That communion in one kind

is not forbid by Chriſt, whoſe laws and injunctions cannot be violated upon any pretence whatever; 2dly, "one half of the "Lord's ſupper", as you are pleaſed to ſay, is not "witheld from the people; for then it would be a ſacrilege to receive it in one kind, which the primitive church would not have ſuffered; 3dly, Neither the teſtament of Ch iſt is violated, nor the people deprived of our bleſſed Saviour's legacy, both which are impieties which the primitive church would have abhorred. Whence it may fairly be concluded that receiving it in one or other kinds was regarded, as I have already obſerved, by the primitive church as a point of diſcipline only; which therefore the church had full authority to change at any time for juſt reaſons.

Now among the reaſons given, the chief was (as you may find in the Catechiſ. ad Parochos de Euchariſt. Sacram. Sect. 70.) to prevent even caſual and involuntary prophanations by ſpilling any drops of the conſecrated wine, which was almoſt unavoidable in a great croud of communicants. Another reaſon given likewiſe in the aboveſaid tract for ſo doing was that many conſtitutions can neither endure the ſmell or taſte of wine. For this

this reaſon the French proteſtants, in their ſynod held at Poitiers, anno 1560, decreed (chapter 13. Art. 7. of the Lord's ſupper) "that the bread of our Lord's ſupper ought to "be adminiſtered to thoſe who cannot drink "wine, upon their making proteſtation that "it is not out of contempt; and endeavour-"ing what they can poſſibly do to obviate all "ſcandal, even by approaching the cup as "near to their mouths as they are able." This you may think, Sir, to be good proteſtant teſtimony, that receiving the communion in one one kind is neither a ſacrilege, or a violation of any divine precept. For if it were, no neceſſity could excuſe it; and they who could not receive both kinds, would be obliged to receive neither the one or the other. Luther himſelf thought it a matter of ſuch indifference that, to vent his ſpleen againſt the church he had relinquiſhed, declared that "if a coun-"cil ſhould appoint or permit communion in "both kinds, he would in ſpite of that coun-"cil, either receive it in one kind, or in nei-"ther." When Carloſtadius, in the year 1521, had given the cup to the people of Wirtemberg; Luther, becauſe he had not done it himſelf, complained that Carloſtadius had made chriſtianity to conſiſt of trifles, ſuch as communion under both kinds, Soe Hiſt. des Variet. ſect. 10. with the references.

It may be aſked why the church altered altered her diſcipline in this reſpect? It is certain ſhe heretofore commanded the laity publicly to receive in both kinds, private communions excepted. This was done with a view of excluding the Manicheans from the communion of the faithful, who held the cup to be unlawful, and not be the body and blood uf Chriſt, but the gall of the devil. So now ſhe commands them to receive under the form of bread only, to exclude ſuch as hold that Chriſt is not taken whole and entire under either kind.

"It is not neceſſary" you ſay Sir, "to "ſpeak of the doctrines of purgatory, of pray-"ers for the dead, of indulgences, and many "more," p. 14. having plumed yourſelf, I ſuppoſe, with what you have ſo *wonderfully* executed. You then addreſs yourſelf to thoſe who ſeparated from your church; in whoſe hands, by far more able than mine, I leave you. It is indeed with pleaſure I relinquiſh a ſubject, which has been very painful to me in every point of view. It is painful to me to have you, Sir, for an antagoniſt, whoſe friendſhip I courted by every means poſſible in my power. It pains me moreover to have been *forced* to touch upon my own doctrines, which however I have endeavoured to do with

as

as light a hand as the nature of the ſubject would poſſibly admit. Remember, Sir, I am not the aggreſſor. You have called me forth, although you ſay, p. 14. that "with the opi-"nions of individuals you do not interfere," (which to ſome people may appear in the preſent inſtance a ſpecies of contradiction); and I was bound to obey, or ſtand convicted of the folly and abſurdity of adhering to the principles which I profeſs.

It grieves me however to ſuppoſe, even for a moment, that the little I have ſaid, *in my own defence*, may thwart the opinions of any of thoſe valuable friends I have the honor and happineſs to be known to. It grieves me to have been obliged to ſtate facts (at leaſt ſuch as appear to me to be facts) which may deviate from, and be repugnant to the ideas of that venerable bench of biſhops, who, with a true chriſtian ſpirit, and with a liberality and generoſity peculiar to themſelves, voted the emancipation of a handful of unoffending people; conſcious (as St. Auguſtine ſays) that "that faith is fictitious which is enforced by "the edge of the ſword. It more particularly grieves me that any thing ſhould have dropped from my pen which may poſſibly deprive me of that portion of regard, which I am as earneſt

earneſt to preſerve, as I am conſcious I ſo little merit. I mean, Sir, the reſpectable prelate who preſides over your college*. I ſpeak of a man, whoſe virtues I look up to with reverence and veneration, and therefore am happy in having an opportunity (for which, Sir, I am indebted to you) of paying a grateful tribute due to his juſtice and merit.

Before however I take my laſt farewell of you, give me leave, Sir, to aſk you one queſtion. What could induce you, at a time when all religious litigation and rancour ſeems to have ſubſided, to revive the odious controverſy, and attack a handful of people who never gave you the leaſt offence? I ſay a handful; for, including men, women, and children, (for I have not the honor of being your pariſhioner) they do not exceed eight in number. And I appeal to you if they are not as orderly, decent, and well-behaved people as any in your pariſh. Reflect, Sir, on the dreadful ſentence you have paſſed on them and me! If what you ſay is true, (which I truſt and know to be otherwiſe) we are no leſs than fools and idolaters! Thus, as far as in you lay, you have expoſed us to the con-

* Brazen Noſe, Oxford.

tempt,

tempt, derision and execration of all our neighbours. Such is your charity! But we appeal from the ill-founded sentence; we conceive that we have, according to the leading feature of the reformation, an equal right with yourself to expound the scriptures: We know likewise (and in some instances I have shown it) that we have the doctrine and practice of the primitive church to support us under the pressure of your illiberal censnre. To these I may add the sanction of the whole legislative body of this country for 900 years together, when our religion was uniformly professed by the nation. Such are our titles. By way of palliative you tell your readers in your preface, that you was "induced to pub-"lish your address by the advice of one or "two highly esteemed friends." No, Sir. They neither could be your friends, or the friends of society. If they really meant to give you that advice, what judgment are we to form of their intellects and philanthropy? You have often, I dare say, reprobated the fiery zeal of those four polemics who heretofore would force every man to think as they they did. Why then would you tread in the same detested path? Cannot you, Sir, enjoy the good things which kind providence has bestowed

beſtowed upon you, without endeavouring to tear off thoſe bandages which the humanity of the legiſlature has applied to the wounds heretofore inflicted on us by a falſe and miſguided policy? If in the courſe of this letter any exceptionable word has eſcaped my pen, I beg you will reflect on the cruel epithets you have beſtowed on thoſe who differ in opinion from you. Believe me, Sir, purity of manners; a humane and charitable diſpoſition towards the poor, with the other ſocial virtues (which I dare ſay you poſſeſs, charity towards us alone excepted) will gain you more proſelytes, than volumes of cenſures on thoſe who, from conſcientious motives, diſſent from you on matters of religion.

I remain,

Reverend Sir,

Your humble ſervant,

6 MA 50

WARKWORTH,
OCTOBER 31, 1795.

Fra: Eyre.